

T/B
Oct

H.9
324 - 10
9H2
11.60

Revised
A 5/4



C. L. 29.

COLLEGE LIBRARY



Class No.....

Book No.....

Acc. No....**3096**.....

THE FUTURE of THE JEWS

A
Symposium
edited by
J. J. LYNX



LINDSAY DRUMMOND LIMITED

6 Buckingham Street, London, W.C. 2

First published 1945

298

THIS BOOK IS PRODUCED IN
COMPLETE CONFORMITY WITH THE
AUTHORIZED ECONOMY STANDARDS

*Made in Great Britain. Printed at the St Ann's Press,
Altrincham, Cheshire*

Contents

	PAGE
1. Preface	7
2. Thomas Mann: <i>Prologue</i>	13
3. Dr. Edvard Benes ^v : <i>A Message</i>	17
4. S. Adler-Rudel: <i>The Agony of a People</i>	19
5. Edward Hulton: <i>The Jew in the World of the Future</i>	41
6. Professor Hyman Levy: <i>The Problem of Assimilation</i>	58
7. Camille Huysmans: <i>The Jewish State</i>	67
8. Dr. Josef Heller: <i>Zionism and the Jewish Problem</i>	71
9. Blanche E. C. Dugdale: <i>Zionism and the Jewish Settlement</i>	83
10. Elizabeth A. Allen: <i>Anti-Semitism and its Cure</i>	93
11. Dr. A. Steinberg: <i>The Fight Against Anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia</i>	101
12. Mrs. M. Corbett Ashby and Sir Norman Angell: <i>Great Britain and the Jews</i>	110
13. Dr. Lev Zelmanovits: <i>Political Status of the Jews in Post-War Europe</i>	120
14. Otto Lehmann-Russbuehdt: <i>Should and Could the Jews Return to Germany?</i>	134
15. A Refugee: <i>Should and Could We Return to Germany?</i>	152
16. Reginald Sorensen, M.P.: <i>Our Common Humanity</i>	169
17. Louis Golding: <i>Epilogue</i>	184
Index	191
Biographical Notes	193

Preface

THIS book is a collection of essays discussing and suggesting the solution of a problem which has grown alarmingly during the last quarter of a century, reaching its culminating point during this war. The contributors, who belong to all classes of society and thought, include Gentiles and Jews alike, and in certain instances, in their approach to a solution, their viewpoints are in opposition. They investigate the subject from all possible angles, with a view to finding a way out of the jungle of difficulties, misunderstandings and narrow-mindedness which have made the Jewish problem and its moral consequences a nightmare to all decent citizens. This book does not, by any means, claim to have solved the problem of a better future for the Jews. This would be impossible, if only because of the limited space in which this limitless problem is discussed in these pages; and because of the great reluctance, official and unofficial, to discuss new ideas for securing the very existence and survival of the world's greatest sufferers. Some consider the Future of the Jews a problem which should be dealt with only by Jews; others say that it is a question each nation must settle for itself, concerning only the peoples and countries in which it is brought up for discussion, the solution depending on their national and economic structure. Others again are of the opinion that the Future of the Jews is not important at all, while still others say that it should be dealt with, once and for all, internationally, by an agreement between all peoples and nations, settling the Jewish question by law, in the same way that international postage, dope smuggling and the gold standard are settled. These people are most disappointed to hear that that will scarcely do. Numerous, too, are those who do not want to discuss the question at all, preferring to shirk the responsibility of saying or doing anything before committing themselves, although such people often include those who could be the most effective sponsors of new and constructive ideas, thus helping to build up the Future of the Jews. They, however, are afraid of the tremendous complexity of the question. They resemble the people who find some of the letters they receive so unpleasant and difficult to answer that instead of giving the writer of the letter the precise and just reply he deserves, they put them away in a cupboard so that in the end the letter answers itself. Or, as a cynic put it to me the other day, shrugging his shoulders: "There is, at least, no need to bother about the Jewish question on the Continent after the war. There will scarcely be any Jews

left in Europe to form a serious problem. Although Nazi Germany has lost the war, it still has won "heroically" the war against the Jews, and if 20 per cent have survived—which I doubt—it will be more a question of immediate relief than anything else."

Despite the cruel forthrightness and the negative cynicism of that statement, I am afraid it is fairly correct. It is correct in its unspoken accusation of the shoulder-shrugging indolence which preceded the Jewish tragedy, and made the cries of agony of an entire people pass unheard. Those few who, after the war, will have survived the death factories and gas chambers, will scarcely understand that after ten years of mental and physical torture they are now free human beings again. I doubt whether they will have any strength left to survive at all, still less to believe in a new future for themselves.

Thus the problem of the Future of the Jews urgently concerns those who have survived outside Hitler-controlled Europe. They are under an obligation to build up a better future for the surviving few, not as a barely tolerated minority of foreigners, who are often disliked, but as full partners of all free peoples. And it should never be forgotten that the Jews of the entire world were not only the first victims of National Socialism's War, but the very first Allies of the United Nations: Hitler's enemy No. 1; and that from first to last they believed in victory of Right.

This symposium, however, has no intention of advertising the virtues of the Jews or proving that all Jews are angels; nor does it accuse Christianity, as such, of the wrongs done to suffering Jewry. Both ideas are utterly wrong, although both have been driven to the point of exhaustion, and so have caused more destruction to a common understanding than many deeds of goodwill can ever repair. This symposium is a sober investigation into a burning problem, which concerns everyone not biased by narrow dislike or petty gossip and grumbles. Its purpose is to awaken the consciences of those who "cannot be bothered," to make them realise that the Jews are not a strange and curious inferior people which must be "looked after" and told what to do, but no stranger than any other people, be they Australians, Chinese or Brazilians, and that merely to be kind to them, to "tolerate" them, and try to get rid of them one way or another, simply will not do. It intends to demonstrate that Jews are human beings, fighting for the very survival of their race. It won't do either to pity the Jews. So long as they are looked on as one looks at freaks at a fair or animals in the Zoo the future of the Jews will be dark indeed.

So the question of the Future of the Jews is dealt with in these pages on the basis that they should be full partners of all civilised peoples and Allies of the United Nations. It does not merely ventilate the question of settling the Jewish plight of being a people without a country by touching only on the problem of the National Jewish Home, it also investigates the possibility of a Jewish State-like Home somewhere else, apart from Palestine. It discusses the pros and cons of assimilation or separation of Jews living in non-Jewish countries, and last but not least it deals with a question very near home to most readers: the question of the refugees from Europe, now in this country.

This question forms a very important part of the whole problem, and no fewer than four essays are dedicated to it. It is vital to the countries offering hospitality and to the refugees alike, and some very important and constructive answers are given to the whole complex problem which, with the ending of the war and the return to normality, already occupies the minds of millions all over the world. Three non-Jews of international political standing and knowledge discuss the refugee problem, and an anonymous German refugee gives his personal point of view.

To discuss the future of the Jewish refugees it was necessary to investigate the past. For the phenomenon of the refugee problem is that it needed the ruthless triumph of Totalitarianism to make the world conscious of the unprecedented magnitude to which it had grown. Now that even the most hesitant are convinced that the problem is not just a matter of the spiritual wickedness of some philo-Semites or pro-Jewish propagandists, but a political and human question, it has become a world-wide concern. And what once was considered a mere migration question has now developed into a test ground of post-war goodwill. Thus it is on the important chapter of the historic survey that the entire symposium and its understanding are based.

The refugee problem of the future is considered first as an economic problem, and then as a political one. Fear that the refugees who have found shelter in this country might take away work and bread from the soldiers returning home, is one of the most dominating factors, influencing the entire problem. Fantastic figures are quoted of refugees in this country and elsewhere, supposed to form a serious menace to the coming struggle for existence of the British and other peoples. It must be repeatedly stated that these figures circulated and broadcast with a special purpose are not correct.¹

¹ See S. Adler-Rudel's contribution.

The burning question of whether the Jewish refugees will return or not is divided right from the start into two parts. One category is of refugees of Jewish origin, subjects of Allied countries. Their number is small, so small that compared with the population of Great Britain it forms an infinitesimal minority. The chances are that most of these Allied subjects will return to their homeland rather than remain abroad. In the end their country will have been liberated, and free again, and they will be eager to help rebuild it. The solution of their future will be found in an international settlement of the Jewish question which undoubtedly must be sought.

The other category whose future is completely uncertain, who see small opportunity of returning to the land of their birth, are the Jewish refugees especially from Germany and Austria. Their country will not be liberated but conquered. The ties they have with the country of their birth are, in most cases, completely cut. Their next of kin, if doomed to remain in Hitler Europe, will have been killed or will have disappeared. Their number (50,000 at the very most) is irrelevant. They do not form an economic obstacle or a menace in the labour market. Apart from economic and political reasons, however, there is still another point to be considered—the emotional aspect. The handful of German Jews who were lucky enough to escape Hitler's grip will resent it very much if they are "pushed around" any more. Before the war they were pushed around from land to land, from country to country, chased, expelled, not wanted by anybody, until they had the great luck to find a permanent refuge in a free and generous democratic country. Many of them have been out of the Reich for more than twelve years and are accustomed to being treated as human beings. Many of them have brought with them additional industries, work, inventions, and thus repaid in a small way the generous hospitality which they have received. Many of them have fought for the cause of the Allies. All of them have worked for freedom and the principles of the Atlantic Charter. For them, after living in the freedom of England, return to Germany might seem like a return to a slaughterhouse.

There may be some Jews from Germany and Austria who want to return for one reason or another. Nobody should stop them if they are prepared to go. There are others, however, who see the day coming when they will be on the road again, the eternal Wandering Jew, unwanted by everybody, turned out from their temporary shelter, on the search for a new existence, a new place to sleep in peace, for a land, a home. And fear has already gripped their hearts.

Let us hope that this fear is unfounded and that such a fate will not again be theirs, and that some public and official reluctance will adopt new ways to settle that comparatively small problem of these homeless Jews not by rigid laws and severe decrees but in a truly human way. Then the greater and the bigger problems of Jewry can be tackled seriously and vigorously, aiming for a complete agreement on the Future of the Jews.

Whether this future lies in the land of hope, Palestine, or in an international organisation for the representation of Jewish rights and status, the future of the Jews cannot be considered at all promising. Those who have contributed to these pages have made it clear that the destinies of Jewry can be solved, that their future can be assured, and that it can be a better future. It is up to the powers that be to assure the Jews that their sympathies towards those who have suffered so much have not dwindled with the approach of victory; that the promises given to the Jews are not hollow words, but sincere obligations, to fulfil which should be a point of honour; and that to discuss the Jewish problem as a whole the standpoint of Jews as well as Gentiles should be heard. I hope therefore that this book will be a useful contribution towards the understanding of this most complex problem.

J.J.L.

Prologue

The Fall of the European Jews

By

THOMAS MANN

AT the beginning of the Nazi regime in Germany, it was stated that the Jews were only to be excluded from the life of the nation; they were to live as tolerated guests, but they were to be permitted to devote themselves without interference to their own culture and education. This phase quickly passed. Soon the mania for torture was stopping at nothing. What kind of men are these, what kind of monsters who never tire of raping, to whom every misery that they inflict upon the most peaceable, most unbrutal and unviolent of their victims, is merely incitement to push them into still deeper, still more merciless misery? Ultimately they arrived at the maniacal resolution of the total extermination of the European Jewry. "It is our aim," said Goebbels in a radio speech, "to exterminate the Jews. Whether we win or are defeated, we must and will reach this aim. Should the German armies be forced to retreat, they shall on their way wipe the last Jew off the earth."

No reasonable being can follow the train of thought of these putrid brains. What for? we ask ourselves. Why? Whom does it serve? Would anybody be better off if the Jews were exterminated? Did the wretched liar talk himself after all into believing that his master's war of spoilation had been instigated by "World Jewry," and that this "World Jewry" would be frightened into opposing the war against the Nazis when it learnt that the death of the Nazis would also mean the death of the last Jew in Europe? I for my part believe that the returning German armies will have other things on their minds than pogroms. But until they are beaten, the annihilation of the Jews is proceeding with horrible seriousness. The number of those who have perished partly by direct massacre, partly by planned starvation, ran into millions even by the end of last year; since then it has very substantially increased. The highest number of victims is made up of Eastern Jews, a type of human being whom, in the view of the inventors of the German master race, it is their mission to exterminate. In reality, East European Jewry is a reservoir of latent cultural forces from whose soil an amazing

amount of genius and talent has accrued to occidental art and science.

The Jewish race is known to excel in two special talents: the medical and the musical. Already in the Middle Ages the Jewish doctor, apart from his Arabian colleagues, was the most desired and trusted. According to my own experience, he is to this day the wisest, gentlest, most understanding and most trustworthy—not to speak of the great Jewish scientists and discoverers in the field of medicine, benefactors of mankind such as Ehrlich, August von Wassermann, whose bloodtesting method has conquered the earth, and the great enlarger of the knowledge of the human soul, Sigmund Freud. As far as music is concerned, it is just here among us in America that the prodigies of the concert hall are living, such artists as Menuhin, Horowitz, Heifetz, Milstein, Serkin, Rubinstein, Huberman, Schnabel, the conductors Walter and Koussewitzki, Ormandy and Steinberg. They all have their genealogical roots in East European Jewry. If I am told those are only reproductive accomplishments, only virtuosity, then I name creative representatives of modern music like Gustav Mahler and Arnold Schönberg. It is a fact, after all, that the work of the hero of German national Romanticism, Richard Wagner, who may have had a Jewish father himself, disowns the influence of neither Meierbeer nor Mendelssohn.

The greatest theoretical physicist of our epoch, Albert Einstein, comes from that human sphere which an abnormal lout thinks he must extirpate.

From Eastern Jewry came the famous British actor who two years ago fell a victim to the ruthless conduct of war of the Nazis, Leslie Howard. His original name was Stainer, and probably his parents were the first of the family to immigrate to England. But nobody could have been more English than this performer whom I mention because he is an example of the peculiar phenomenon that national characteristics frequently find their truest, most convincing artistic manifestations when they pass through the medium of the Jewish temperament.

Never could a spiritual, cultured and philo-European man in Germany be an anti-Semite. In Germany it was the Catholic Church and the Jews who by their mere existence represented the Universalistic European principles against a narrow and anticultural nationalism. Also, it would be a total error to attribute to the great majority of the German people an anti-Semitism that would provide a popular basis for the Nazi crimes against the Jews. We have the testimony

of an elderly Jewish professor who escaped a few months ago from Germany into Switzerland, that according to his observation eighty per cent of the population reject the violence against the Jews and often go so far as to express their feelings in very demonstrative fashion. Many make their good will known by giving cigars and cigarettes to Jews, by presenting sweets to the children, by offering their seats in the tramways and undergrounds and in a hundred other ways. Furious admonitions in the newspapers indicated that the obligation to wear the star of David had by no means accomplished its purpose of isolating the Jews from the rest of the population. The professor related that one day in a public square he had been approached by a total stranger who said to him: "Do not lose courage! Things will change some day."

In view of this, I have no doubt that if the Germans in their isolated country were permitted to know the truth about events such as the tragic perishing of the Jews in the Warsaw Ghetto and the preceding epic struggle, they would shudder before their rulers and before themselves.

Things will change, and Israel will survive, as it always has survived. But what it suffers to-day cries to Heaven, and we, who boast that we are fighting for humanity and human dignity against barbarism, must ask ourselves whether we are at least doing everything in our power to allay this indescribable suffering which debases all humanity, as long as we cannot prevent it. Perhaps it is too cheap to declare: "One cannot do more than wage war against the Nazis." Only little can be done because much was neglected before the war while there were still great possibilities to act. We retain shameful memories of those bygone days. I only want to recall that phantom ship with Jewish refugees, which sailed the seas in the year 1939 without finding a port of admission until finally the emigrants were received by Holland and Belgium, both small countries. The world in the inertia of its heart permitted Hitler to deride it. He challenged it: If you are so humane, why don't you accept the Jews? But you are not willing to do that anywhere. Why were the Jews not offered shelter, while there was still time, in those countries that had enough room and use for working hands, at least temporary shelter, without the obligation to keep them for good? In this connection small Switzerland deserves honourable mention because it has received many despite its lack of room and its precarious position; and it could have received many more if it could have served as a point of transit and if there had been the guarantee that the Jews would obtain another haven elsewhere. The possibilities of escape for

the Jews in Europe would have been considerably greater in this case.

But even to-day it is not too late for this. The Immigration Laws of the great democracies are designed for normal times when there was a limited need for emigration from Europe, and they are not adapted to the monstrous conditions now prevailing there. It is not human, not democratic, and it serves to show a moral Achilles heel to the Fascist enemies of mankind if one clings with bureaucratic coldness to these laws under present circumstances, instead of proving by their timely modification that this war is indeed waged for humaneness and human dignity. Let us remember a word from Churchill to the effect that every friend of Hitler is by nature our enemy, a word that surely implies, at the same time, that every enemy and every victim of Nazism is our natural friend and ally, and fully entitled to our help.

May all who are deeply concerned with the Future of the Jews radiate waves of compassion, indignation, and a determination to help, which will reach perhaps and frighten the murderers of right and humanity, but above all move those who have the power and the means to alleviate the suffering of our time!

A Message

By

DR. EDVARD BENEŠ^v

THE Jewish problem, along with many others relating to reconstruction of the life of our State after the conclusion of the war, has greatly occupied my thoughts. It represents an important factor in our efforts to secure civil liberty and social justice in Czechoslovakia within the framework of a genuine and improved new order which, as a sequel to the chaos let loose upon the world by the insane Nazi experiment, is certainly destined to come into existence.

In the restored Czechoslovak Republic all sections of the population, in as far as they have shown themselves and will show themselves in the future to be capable of aiding the work of the State, must receive due justice. Religious freedom is, of course, the first presupposition and foundation, and one which cannot be dispensed with by any properly organised State. We shall not deviate in any way from the principles of true and honest democracy to which we adhered in creating our first republic. They led us to progress, peace and development. They have never ceased and never will cease to guide us.

The suffering of the Jews in the lands occupied by the blood-thirsty Axis tyrants forms one of the most tragic chapters in the history of mankind. But all this is only temporary. It will all soon be overcome by the principle of healthy strength, wisdom and humanity. This ghastly period is only a bridge to a new one which will bring rectification and retribution to innocent people and particularly to the Jews for the lawless havoc spread by the ferocious and insane Nazi system under the direction of its crazed Führer.

Our people are not and never will be anti-Semitic. Masaryk used to say that anti-Semitism is bestiality and barbarism. But anti-Semitism is more than barbarism. It is a dangerous spiritual infection which, as we have seen, can spread from country to country. And so all the civilised nations must be on their guard against it. In my opinion there can be no doubt that the Jewish problem is a world problem. So it is impossible to base the solution of the Jewish question upon the internal affairs of any one State.

Edvard Beneš

It is in my opinion a typical problem which will have to be solved after this war on a world-wide international basis within the whole framework of the organisation of the Europe of to-morrow and the world of to-morrow.

The Zionist idea and the work of the Jews in Palestine will play an important part in this world solution of the future of the Jews. During the quarter of a century or so which has passed since the Balfour Declaration the Jews in Palestine have achieved a notable amount of work. I believe that it will be possible for them to continue in this work in their national home with still greater success after the war.

The Agony of a People

By

S. ADLER-RUDEL

I

THE Jews are passing through the darkest period of their long and tragic history. The memories of brutalities committed by the Crusaders, the tortures of the Spanish Inquisition, the pogroms in Czarist Russia, the many stages of martyrdom which left their mark on every Jewish generation, seem to lose their horrors by comparison. Terrible as the persecutions of the past were, they were mainly confined to one country, or even only to certain parts of a country. There was nearly always a means of escape to new districts—or other countries. The number of Jews who were burnt alive, who were forced to accept baptism, who lost their homes, their children, their lives, was limited in every period of history to a fraction of the people.

To-day, about half of all the Jews of the world are in deadly peril. The Nazis have brought slavery, persecution and terror to many peoples in Europe, but they have singled out the Jews for complete annihilation. The methods they apply are based on a well-considered system, where every detail has been coldly and precisely calculated. The technical problem of how to kill millions of human beings without leaving any trace of them has been solved by German ingenuity and skill. But even German efficiency in sealing up the whole Continent from all contact with the outer world could not prevent the news about the terrible fate of the Jews leaking out. At first, the monstrous details seemed incredible. The whole idea that the Germans were out to destroy millions of men, women and children, old and young, for the sole reason that they were Jews, sounded absurd and unbelievable. People who had never experienced life under the Nazi rule refused to believe that even under war conditions such cruelties could be ordered by a Government representing nearly seventy million people living in the heart of Europe. To-day, German official publications, carefully collected documents in the hands of the Allied Governments, authentic reports of eye-witnesses, have convinced even the most sceptical diplomats that the process of exterminating the Jews in Nazi-occupied territories is continuing day after day, week after

week, since Hitler's speech in the Sportpalast in Berlin on September 30th, 1942, when he repeated his threats uttered in January 1939 that "another world war would end in the annihilation of the Jewish race in Europe."

The curtain of silence which for a long time surrounded the slaughter of Jews in Nazi-occupied territories has been lifted. The atrocities committed by Nazis against Jews are recorded in the free Press of the world. The horrible plight of the Jews provoked declarations of sympathy and pity by the Allied Nations, and the British Parliament rose in homage to their martyrdom. Governments issued strongly worded statements. Rescue bodies, inter-governmental committees and governmental departments were created to alleviate their sufferings. The appreciation of these widely visible demonstrations of sympathy and pity which soothed the conscience of humanity and brought consolation and hope to millions of Jews, is not diminished by the fact that they came late and remained almost entirely ineffective; in fact, they have been of little practical help towards the rescue of the first and most suffering victims of the Nazis. But the publicity, often intermingled with vague promises for the future, is apt to influence the less-informed about the past experiences of the Jews; it creates the erroneous impression that the defeat of the Nazis would automatically solve the Jewish problem and bring salvation to the Jewish people. To believe it means to ignore the fact that Hitler is not the inventor of anti-Semitism, but merely its most cruel executioner. The Nazis' war against the Jews must prove to the world the unique nature and dimension of the Jewish problem; a problem derived from the homelessness of the Jews as a people, from their dispersal amongst the peoples of the world, and from the fact that they form a minority wherever they are. To realise this means to recognise the world-wide implications of the Jewish question, which will remain a problem to the world until a final and just solution has been found.

II

The economic and political difficulties, persecutions and pogroms which the Jews experienced in the years preceding the first world war were confined to Eastern Europe, mainly Russia and Rumania, with populations of 6,000,000 and 250,000 Jews respectively. In the Austro-Hungarian Empire the Jewish population of 2,500,000 was subjected to civil discrimination and economic elimination. Occasional outbursts of anti-Jewish feeling such as the Dreyfus

affair in France, and social and cultural handicaps in Germany and other Western European countries, did not endanger the comparative safety of their small Jewish communities.

The outbreak of the world war brought the Jews many complications, difficulties and sufferings, growing in intensity the longer the war lasted. Jews had always been loyal citizens of their adopted countries and their justifiable grievances and complaints against the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Governments did not prevent them from putting in their maximum war effort. Hundreds of thousands of Jewish youths responded wholeheartedly to the mobilisation orders and joined the armies of their countries. Actual participation of Jews in the war amounted to 1,500,000 soldiers of whom 1,050,000 fought on the Allied side, and 450,000 on the side of the Central Powers. The participation of the Jews in all armies, their losses in dead and wounded—figures of which will be given later on—was in all countries at least equal to and, in many cases, even higher than their percentage of population. They were imbued with the same patriotic feeling, and—like their Gentile compatriots—nourished the hope that a victorious end of the war would improve their situation; they envisaged the beginning of a democratic era in Russia, social and economic progress in Austria and Germany. But they were soon bitterly disappointed.

Eastern Europe, where over 7,000,000 Jews had their homes, was one of the main theatres of war, where the civil population had to endure the unavoidable hardships which accompany military actions. The Jews had more than a fair share in that. The Russian High Command started the war with the humiliating evacuation of between 500,000 and 600,000 Jews from the Western frontiers, without making any adequate preparations for their reception elsewhere. In Austria between 400,000 and 500,000 Jews from Galicia and the Bukowina, escaping from the advancing Russian armies, received a hostile reception in the Western parts of Austria. The German High Command, when entering the Polish part of Russia, told the Jews by leaflets that they were coming as liberators, but actually deported tens of thousands to Germany for forced labour. Strong anti-Semitic propaganda flared up in Germany, blaming the Jews for all the difficulties which the population had to endure, and questioning their loyalty.

Anti-Semitic speeches in the Reichstag were of frequent occurrence, resulting in 1916 in a census of Jews in the various branches of the war services (*Judenzaehlung*). In 1918 this anti-Semitic agitation became intensive and even dangerous when hopes of a

German victory were vanishing. The Junker and military caste responsible for this propaganda was already looking for a scapegoat; and the legend that the Jews were the cause of Germany's defeat began to spread in the army and amongst the civilians. The seeds for events to come were sown in the hearts and minds of the German people during the world war at a time when tens of thousands of Jews were fighting in the German army. During those years of war there was not a single place on the Eastern front where Jews were not exposed to persecution by the Russian, Austrian or German soldiery. Whenever the fortunes of war changed in any town on this broad war zone it was the Jews who bore the brunt of the advancing or retreating armies. Were the Russians forced to give up they made the Jews responsible for their defeat, destroyed their houses and plundered their homes, dragging the leading Jews of the communities as hostages with them. When the Austrians or Germans reconquered a town they only too often lent a willing ear to the accusations of the native anti-Semitic elements who denounced the Jews as having relations with the enemy.

The war ended in the West with the armistice, but in the East it continued in the form of revolution, civil war, famine, epidemics and anti-Jewish pogroms of unheard dimensions. The Jews, as the weakest of the minorities in Eastern Europe, suffered again more than all the others. An estimate of Jewish losses in the war and the first post-war years up to 1921 shows the following minimum figures: 171,000 soldiers killed in action, 300,000 wounded, 50,000 civilians killed and 60,000 wounded in about 1,500 pogroms in the years 1917 to 1921. Over 100,000 died as a result of epidemics; 100,000 children became orphaned, and over 500,000 Jews were made homeless. They tried to escape to Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, Austria, Lithuania and Germany and the Western European countries, but were wanted nowhere. None of the new States was willing to accept or to recognise them as citizens. They constituted a considerable part of the masses of people who had been uprooted by the great changes which swept the world after the war, hundreds of thousands of Jews lost their citizenship and became stateless, people without a country, without protection and without rights. The post-war world after the first world war was confronted with the first refugee problem, and failed to solve it, as it failed to solve many other problems.

III

It was fateful for the more than eight million Jews who remained in Eastern Europe after the war, that they had to live in that part of the world where the most complicated and far-reaching social and economic changes of our time took place. The destruction of the two great Empires in Eastern Europe—Russia and Austria-Hungary—meant the destruction of great economic units which had developed for centuries. The large blocks of six million Russian Jews and 2,250,000 Jews from Austria-Hungary were split into many small communities, each of which belonged to another state.

The war had been waged to liberate the smaller nations and give them the right of self-determination, and many a people, oppressed for centuries, gained its independence. The new frontiers of Poland were stretched far beyond the borders of her ethnographic territory. Czechs and Slovaks formed an independent state which included a large German minority; Esthonians, Latvians, Lithuanians and Finns were other liberated peoples gaining their independence. The newly defined frontiers of the Kingdom of Rumania, now including Bessarabia, the Bukowina and parts of former Hungarian and Bulgarian territories, brought many minorities under Rumanian rule, amongst them large numbers of Jews. The creation of the new states marked for the Jews the worst period of the whole war. It almost seemed as if the liberated people competed with each other in polluting the first days of their national liberation and independence with the spilling of Jewish blood. Anti-Semitic excesses in the Ukraine, in Poland, in Rumania, in Lithuania, in Hungary, introduced to the Jews the beginning of the new era of nationalism in Eastern Europe. The Jews braced themselves to endure still further trials, hoping that eventually, once the years of revolution, unrest and famine had passed, they too would gain recognition, equality, and the right to lead a peaceful life.

Once more their hopes were shattered: it was their tragic fate to suffer most cruelly under the harsh conditions of the bewildered years of adolescence of the new states. These states had attained national freedom, but the principle of self-determination of the peoples failed in its practical application. Hardly any of the new states represented ethnical units, while all of them included considerable minorities. The Peace Treaties, which, in a way, were the Charter of the new states, imposed upon them special provisions guaranteeing the cultural, racial, and religious minorities not only

equal political and economic rights, but also a certain amount of national autonomy and the possibility to develop their own cultural inheritance. All the new states, with the exception of Czechoslovakia, accepted these conditions under the pressure of the Great Powers, regarded with suspicion the national minorities in their midst, and did not even try to win their confidence. But while practically all other national minorities received encouragement and even support from their mother nations on the other side of the frontiers or threatened their Governments with the forming of Irredentas, the Jews as the weakest group could not look to anybody for assistance and protection, and had to bear the maximum hardship imposed upon them by the rulers of the new states. The League of Nations, whose task it was to protect the minorities, failed entirely in this respect. The procedure of the League, cumbersome and complicated, its decisions intricate and difficult to apply, were first met by evasion on the part of the Governments concerned, and, when democracies changed into semi-Fascist or dictatorial states, finally ignored. Minority rights were no longer honoured.

On September 13th, 1934, Colonel Beck, the Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs, declared that Poland henceforth refused to co-operate with the League of Nations in the field of minority protection. Rumania and Lithuania did not even bother to make any formal declaration; they never intended to respect the Minority Laws.

The liquidation of the minority section of the Secretariat of the League of Nations (December 1939) was nothing more than the legal recognition of the fact that the experiment of safeguarding the interests of national minorities through an international body without authority and without the power to impose its decisions on the respective Governments, was of no avail.

The situation of the Jews in the transition period between the two wars was little influenced by the well-intended but inefficient minority protection of the League of Nations. They were completely dependent upon the goodwill of their respective Governments, and as years went by their difficulties increased and life became unbearable. This fact should be borne in mind by all those who are considering the future of the Jews after the second world war.

IV

The Peace Treaties after the world war divided Eastern and Central Europe in two groups of states: those which lost the war—

Soviet Union, Germany, the Austrian Republic, Hungary and Bulgaria—and the States which won the war or emerged from the ruins of the broken-up Empires—Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia and Finland. The latter two do not concern us here, because the number of Jews there was very small. Space also prevents one from dealing with the development of the Jews in the Soviet Union except to note that the isolation of the nearly three million Jews in the Soviet Union from the other Jewish communities of the world was one of the greatest blows which the Jewish people suffered after the world war. Russian Jewry provided the Jews of the world for a long time with many spiritual and communal leaders; the various Jewish movements which came into being since the beginning of this century owed their development to the leadership provided by Russian Jewry.

The liberated people showed certain definite characteristics. The overwhelming majority consisted of small farmers and agricultural workers. Backward in their cultural and economic development, they were burdened with the heavy task of building new states in a period of changing economic conditions when even the older states in Western Europe had to work harder than ever to regain their lost economic positions.

The Treaties of Versailles provided the frontiers of the new states, but very little effective advice and guidance. But even if the League of Nations had tried harder to influence the economic and political start of the new states, the exaggerated nationalistic pride which imbued all the liberated nations would have prevented them from accepting guidance from foreigners. The still powerful remnants of the local ruling classes, the great landowners, had a strong and influential position in the leading groups of the new states. They prevented the only possible foundation of a healthy economic situation, viz., introduction of a great agrarian reform and partition of the larger estates. The confiscation of certain estates which belonged to members of the national minorities or previously to the old states, did not provide enough land to satisfy the hunger for land which was common to all peasants in Eastern Europe. The small holdings of the farmers were not developed enough to provide more than the bare necessities of life. The great masses of peasants in all the new states got their national and political freedom, but received very little to feed their wives and children. The industrial situation too was rather complicated. Poland, which had been the industrial backbone of the Russian Empire and whose industry was entirely dependent on the Russian hinterland, had lost its consumers

and was not developed enough to enter into export competition with the industrially more developed Czechoslovakia, Austria or Germany. The readjustment of the industries needed many years; in the meantime too the workers did not earn enough to maintain their families.

Between the two groups, the large agricultural population and the smaller industrial working class, were the Jews, a predominantly urban population through economic and historical development, concentrated in the towns and in the more urban branches of economic life—commerce, handicrafts, industry and the professions, forming a considerable part of the not very numerous middle-class elements of the new states. This peculiar situation of the Jews made it easy for the new governments to develop a whole system of laws and administrative measures which, although formulated in general terms, were apt to impose the burden of the state's finances upon the cities and especially upon the Jews. The cities, although comprising a minority of the population, had to contribute a maximum of the taxes. Parallel with the overtaxation of the cities went the process of the cultural and economic restratification of the dominant nations and the creation of a new middle-class element. This process was fostered by a speedy development of numerous schools, technical institutes, hostels for the children of the peasants, enlargement of possibilities of higher school education and the development of universities. In the economic life the interference of the state became the most important trend in the development of the new states. Taking Poland as a typical example, it can be seen that the state and the city councils were the biggest employers in the country, controlling at the same time the largest part of the national income. One million wage-earners were employed in all forms of the civil service; industrial enterprises controlled by the governments amounted to 2,000, comprising chemical industry, tobacco, matches, salt, spirits, timber and forestry and all the industries working for national defence purposes. Everywhere in all these fields of economic life the state ruled through monopolies and syndicates. Two-thirds of the credit institutions were in the hands of the Government, 80 per cent of all the savings vested in banking institutions of the state. Exports and imports were regulated by a complicated system of licences and currency permits. Chambers of commerce and guilds of artisans were instruments of the whole economic machinery which the state developed. All the jobs in this large number of enterprises, from the director to the porter, were monopolised for the national majori-

ties. Jews were practically excluded from any position in this wide field of economic activities of the state and its subsidiary institutions.

Wherever the state decided to take over a new branch of economic life, a new factory or a new business, the first action was to dismiss the Jews who had been employed there and who had contributed for many years to the development of this enterprise. The development of a large co-operative movement of producers and consumers contributed further to the elimination of the traditional Jewish middle-class elements. A similar process was introduced in the whole field of technical and scientific education. Whereas the state tried in every way to promote the education and professional re-stratification of the children of the majority nation, it became, as time went on, more and more difficult for Jewish children to enter the educational institutions. Numerous clauses and "ghetto benches," if not introduced by law, were instituted by administrative practice of the university authorities. Where the authorities hesitated to reduce the number of Jewish students, the non-Jewish students took the law in their own hands and prevented Jewish students from entering the universities, very often using physical force.

The extreme forms of the "physical pogroms" which opened the history of the new states were changed into the more subtle forms of economic elimination. The permanent and cleverly thought out "cold pogroms" did more damage to the masses of the Jewish population than the occasional outbursts of physical brutality in the past, which, by the way, remained a frequent occurrence also in later years.

The legal enactments of the governments, eliminating the Jews from all spheres of economic life, the undermining of the future of the Jewish youth, the openly demonstrated tendency of members of governments and important political parties to treat the Jews as a "superfluous part of the population" which will have to leave the country, did not satisfy the more radical and more reactionary elements of the population; it only encouraged them to increase the propaganda of hatred and brutality against the Jews. Influential clergymen did not hesitate to preach against the Jews in the churches, advocating the severing of all connections between Gentiles and Jews as a Christian duty.

Although some of the political parties, especially the labour movement and some of the more enlightened peasant parties and even some Catholic priests, stood up against the anti-Jewish

propaganda, their influence was not strong enough to be of effective protection to the Jews, who remained practically alone in the fight for their rights; a fight which became increasingly difficult in view of the progressive abandonment of democracy and the increased influence of the "strong-man" Governments in most of the new states. The Parliamentary form of government became a farce, members of Parliament "yes men" who obeyed the rule of their leaders. A statistical survey, for instance, about the Parliamentary representation of the three million Jews in Poland, forming ten per cent of the population, would show that their percentage in Parliament decreased from election to election, not because the Jews did not participate in the elections, but because the artificial and cleverly constructed size of the constituencies, together with numerous difficulties of formalities, led to a gradual effacement of the most basic political rights of the Jews. Similar methods developed in the city councils. Deprived of their political influence inside the countries, attacked and hated if they tried to refer to the minority protection laws, the situation of the Jews deteriorated from year to year, even before the Nazis entered the political arena in full power.

V

In spite of the economic difficulties and anti-Jewish measures taken by the Governments in most of the states, the Jews in Eastern Europe did not despair. They tried with all their power to adjust themselves to the new conditions and to fit their lives into the framework of the new situation. With the financial help of American Jewry and with almost superhuman energy the Jewish masses in Poland, Rumania and the Baltic States began to rebuild their war-ravaged lives. In the twenty years which elapsed between the two world wars, they have endeavoured to place their economic existence on new foundations. Crowded out and eliminated from their old economic positions, they often successfully tried to establish numerous new industries. As the state educational institutions were closed to them or did not satisfy their needs, the Jews, with their own financial means, founded primary and secondary schools in the Hebrew and Yiddish languages and technical pedagogical institutes.

Cultural institutions of the most varied kinds improved year by year. A large number of Jewish dailies, literary and scientific monthlies, brought enlightenment and hope to the Jewish masses.

In the political field there was extreme activity. The little autonomy left to them, with regard to organising their own affairs,

was widely used. A great Jewish labour movement, organised on Trade Union lines, was conducting a vigorous fight for the "right of work" for the Jewish workers, fighting at the same time side by side with the labour movement and the workers amongst the other people for democracy and progress in the lands of the East. The Zionist Movement received a tremendous impetus. Hundreds of thousands of Jewish boys and girls prepared themselves for a new life in Palestine, developing the great Movement of Hechalutz (Pioneers) which organised not only their training in agriculture and handicrafts for Palestine, but at the same time influenced in a considerable way the professional re-stratification and labourisation of the Jews.

To the many economic and political difficulties which the Jews had to face in the new states of Eastern Europe, was added the restriction of emigration to the U.S.A. In the past emigration to U.S.A. was an escape always open when the economic and political situation for the Jews became unbearable. But Jewish emigration to the U.S.A., which in the years from 1905 to 1914 amounted to over one million persons, was reduced, in consequence of the restrictions imposed by the U.S.A. Government in the early twenties, to 83,000 in the ten years from 1925 to 1934, i.e. to less than 10 per cent of the pre-war figures.

New openings in some of the South American countries were not of considerable relief to the enormously increased necessity for Jewish emigration. The only ray of hope which remained in the difficult years between the two world wars was the Balfour Declaration of the British Government and the prospect of creating a national home in Palestine. In spite of the many difficulties which had to be overcome in developing Palestine, they succeeded in opening the country for over 300,000 Jews from Europe in the inter-war period. It was the sacrifices of the earlier immigrants and of the young Pioneers in the first post-war years which paved the way for the harassed masses of Jews who had to leave Europe when the brutal methods of the Nazis demonstrated to the world the helplessness of the Jews as a people without a home, without a country.

VI

The situation of the Jews in the countries which had lost the war—Hungary, Austria and Germany—did not differ greatly from the methods used in the new states. The countries were nearer to Western Europe, their Jewish communities smaller than in other

countries. The necessity to impress the Western democracies with the good intentions of the losers was strong enough an argument to prevent anti-Jewish measures in the first post-war years, but anti-Jewish trends could be noted everywhere, especially in Hungary. An old state with a ruling class, experienced in political affairs, corrupted and brutal internally, but clever and polite to the outside world, Hungary can claim to be the first country in post-war Europe where democracy was not even given a chance. Horthy, the Hungarian Regent, was the first dictator in Europe who remained in power by a policy of concessions to the West, bribery to the corrupted gentry and brutality to the Jews, labour and other progressive elements. The white terror, which swept the country after the short-lived communist revolution in 1920, was guilty of the most cruel outrages and countless murders of Jews. The murder of hundreds of Jews who were hanged in the Orgowany woods will be remembered as one of the greatest crimes in the history of political terror of our time. The Horthy regime, having been established with the help of the white terror, changed its methods but not its aims to terrorise, plunder and deprive the Jews of all that was left to them after the terror regime. Hungary can also claim to be the first country where anti-Jewish laws were introduced long before the Nazis were ever mentioned. The law 25 of 1920¹ relating to the exclusion of the Jews from the higher educational institutions, opened the way to the many '*numerus clausus*' laws which other countries only considered much later. When the Government hesitated to introduce legal measures, administrative ways were found to eliminate the Jews from economic and public life. Anti-Jewish measures developed uninterruptedly from 1920 to 1938; after that a policy of complete elimination from economic life and the '*numerus clausus*' of the many branches of the cultural life was introduced. The closer the relationship between Hungary and Nazi Germany, the more intense became the persecution of the Jews, always cloaked in excuses and explanations to prevent the world from realising that there was, in reality, no distinction between the intentions of the Nazis and the Hungarian Oligarchy. The Hungarian Jews were even more helpless than their brethren in Eastern Europe, as they had reached a high degree of assimilation; they were fervent patriots and refused to appeal to international or Jewish bodies for help or protection. They hoped in vain that their attitude would impress their rulers, but only made it easier for Horthy and his clique to continue their policy of anti-Jewish persecution.

¹ *Hungary's Alibi*, by W. S. Faber. Lincoln-Prager, London, 1944, p. 21.

The situation in Austria was altogether different as 85 per cent of the Jewish population of 200,000 were concentrated in one city, Vienna. The influence of labour and progressive elements in the immediate post-war years was too strong to permit anti-Jewish legislation. But anti-Semitism, an evil inheritance from the past, prevailed and, from time to time, found its legal expression in many acts of the reactionary Government. Jewish war refugees who came to Austria as citizens of the old monarchy were expelled after the end of the war. The obtaining of citizenship was based on racial laws. Many Jews who had been brought up in the German language and culture, who had fought in the Austrian army, were deprived of their citizenship because "they did not belong to the German race and culture." But still Austria was too much dependent on the outside world to continue this course and certain laws had to be withdrawn. The open anti-Semitic character of the ruling Christian Social Party became clearly visible in 1934 after the *coup d'état* of Dollfuss when Jews were deprived of their positions in the civil service and parts of economic life, and many other anti-Jewish restrictions were introduced.

Dollfuss's successor, Schuschnigg, continued his anti-Jewish policy, and, as far as the Jews were concerned, the Nazis found the ground well prepared.

In Germany, the past is overshadowed by the events after 1933. Here too it would be wrong to say that Hitler was the first to introduce anti-Semitism. The German Republic as such did not yield to anti-Jewish propaganda. But the economic life, suffering under the hardships of a lost war, had badly influenced the position of the Jews. As far back as 1926 it was almost impossible for a young Jew to obtain employment in any of the larger banking institutions, or in one of the big industrial concerns. Boycott of Jews in the economic life of the country was unmistakable. Germany was burdened with masses of unemployed, but the percentage of unemployed Jews was much higher than their percentage in the population and certainly considerably higher than their percentage among the wage-earners. The Jewish middle class, like the rest of the people, had lost their fortunes during the inflation, and anti-Jewish tendencies in the economic life prevented them from improving their lot to the same extent as others when the situation partly changed to the better. The year 1933, therefore, represents more a drastic continuation than a beginning of the decline of German Jewry.

VII

The Nazi revolution in 1933 opened a new chapter in the history of the Jews. Whatever happened in the years before did not greatly impress the Christian world. The countries of Eastern Europe were too remote, the Western world too absorbed in their own problems, to pay much attention to anti-Jewish incidents, which they regarded as an unpleasant nuisance. But Germany—that was different! A civilised people had placed its fate in the hands of a pack of madmen and gangsters. The burning of the Reichstag showed the world what Europe would have to expect. The first attacks of an excited mob against Jews and progressive politicians were followed by the great boycott demonstration of the 1st April, 1933, which, in a way, was the unique event of an official declaration of war of a great state of sixty-five million people on a small number—less than 1 per cent—of its own citizens, the Jews. This declaration of war did not come as a surprise to those who had watched the developments of the Nazi movement. Here was the beginning of a new system in politics based on the principle of testing the ground by attacking the weakest and most helpless group in order to see how the world would react. Had the world reacted in time, had they understood that this declaration of war against the Jews was, at the same time, a declaration of war against civilisation and freedom everywhere, the development of the past ten years might possibly have taken a different course and the world might have been spared the horrors of a new war.

But Governments of the Western democracies considered the events in Germany as an internal affair which, as long as the Germans did not try to export their ideas outside their frontiers, could not be interfered with. Certainly the persecution of the Jews and of other Nazi victims came as a shock to Europe. Here were people whom they knew, men of outstanding qualities, names which were incorporated for ever in the history of science, art, literature. Public opinion rose and protested vigorously, but no action was taken, and the Germans soon discovered that, however far they went inside Germany, it would not prevent foreign statesmen from shaking hands or dining with them. Nobody—so far—was ready to believe that this beginning persecution was not the impulsive act of a mob run amok, but part of a well-considered plan based on the idea of inciting the mob to demonstrate against the Jews, to commit acts of violence and subsequently to demand action from the Government. Every anti-Jewish demonstration engineered and

organised by the Nazi Party was followed by new laws, excluding the Jews from the civil service, educational institutions, professions, one branch of the economic life after another; decrees depriving naturalised Jews of their citizenship, until in 1935 all the decrees were codified in the so-called "Nuremberg Laws" which deprived the Jew of his rights as a German citizen.

On the 15th September, 1935, Hitler, in his Reichstag speech in Nuremberg declared that it was the intention of the Reichstag, by laying down these laws, "to pave the way for a tolerable relationship between Jews and Germans in the Reich." But he did not hesitate to threaten the Jews at the same time that, if they failed to behave in or outside Germany and did not stop their propaganda against the third Reich, more severe measures would be instituted. The Jews in Germany certainly tried to behave, what else could they do! But Jews outside Germany were free to speak their mind, and whatever they said against the Reich was immediately exploited by the Nazis and used against the Jews inside Germany. Indiscriminate legal acts continued. "Spontaneous" patriotic demonstrations, always accompanied by brutal outrages against the Jews, became daily occurrences until 1938, when the Germans suddenly decided to expel at short notice all the Jews of Polish citizenship. Fifteen thousand of these unfortunate people were deported to the Polish frontier where Polish authorities refused them the entry into Polish territory. Once more the world was shocked by German barbarity. The terrible sufferings of the victims, herded together, driven to and from the frontiers by German and Polish soldiery, incited a young Jew in Paris, whose parents were amongst the deportees, to such an extent that he assassinated an official of the German embassy there. This single act of a despairing young man gave the Germans the long-wanted excuse for putting into effect their new terror policy. Space does not permit one to enumerate what happened in those nights and days of the "long knives," of tens of thousands of Jews thrown into concentration camps, brutally murdered, of Jewish homes and still-existing business enterprises destroyed, of Jewish synagogues burnt, Jewish cemeteries desecrated. Once again the "spontaneous" patriotic acts were followed by governmental laws imposing upon the Jews a fine of 85 million pounds to repair the damage caused by the "patriots." Within a few days further "legal" steps were taken, excluding the Jews almost altogether from employment in industry, economic enterprises, and from participation in co-operative societies, without repayment of their shareholdings. They were refused public assistance and the

Jewish communities had to bear the costs of providing for an enormously increased number of people who had become destitute overnight. The next step was the taking of administrative measures to expel them from their homes. On December 6th, 1938, the head of the Berlin police issued an order prohibiting Jews from entering theatres, cinemas, concert and lecture halls, museums, sport arenas, public baths and open-air swimming pools. All licences for cars and motor cycles were withdrawn.

In the meantime, Hitler struck again at the now weakest of his victims—Austria—thereby increasing in March 1938 the number of Jews under his rule by another 190,000. This was followed by the occupation of the Sudetenland in September 1938, and the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia, the only democratic country still left in Central Europe, bringing another 360,000 Jews into his power or delivering them into the hands of his henchmen in Slovakia or Hungary. In September 1939, at the outbreak of the war, over one million Jews had already been subjected to this terrible persecution. The world followed these cruel German politics with a feeling of utter helplessness. Jewish refugees became a burden to neighbour countries, an object of philanthropic organisations who did their utmost in order to alleviate their sufferings.

In October 1933 the League of Nations appointed Mr. James J. McDonald as High Commissioner for Refugees coming from Germany, "to negotiate and direct the international collaboration necessary to solve the economic, financial and social problem of the refugees." The High Commissioner, with the help of the many Jewish and non-Jewish philanthropic organisations, worked hard, but achieved little, and tendered his resignation in December 1935, as he felt that his efforts were useless without the necessary power to enforce them. Developments of 1935–1939 justified Mr. McDonald's desperate step. The situation grew worse from year to year. The numbers of refugees increased, the countries of the world became more and more unwilling to accept any more. The world was divided into two groups of countries, one which expelled the Jews, and the other which did not admit them. Ships laden with human freight were crossing the seas, unable to find a port of refuge for their unhappy passengers. The generous attempt of the President of the U.S.A., who convened an international conference at Evian in June 1938 in order to discuss ways and means of solving this refugee problem, also did not bring forth any effective result, as all attempts were based on the idea of negotiating with the German Government with a view to persuading them to change

their inhuman attitude. The world failed even then to recognise the true character of Nazism and the utter hopelessness of arguing with them. The comparatively small refugee problem of the pre-war days remained unsolved.

Until September 1939 not more than about 200,000 Jews escaped the Nazi hell to safety. Approximately another 150,000 Jews, who had found refuge in the European countries, were trapped by the war and once more fell into the hands of their persecutors.

VIII

The outbreak of the war in September 1939 introduced the last and most terrible chapter of the Jewish tragedy. Every new advance of the German armies brought new masses of Jews into the hands of the Nazis.

TABLE I.
TIME TABLE AND ESTIMATED NUMBERS OF VICTIMS OF THE WAR
OF EXTERMINATION AGAINST THE JEWS, 1933 TO 1943.

1		2	3	4
Dates of Hitler's conquests		Countries	Numbers of Jews	Numbers of Jewish dead up to 1943
January	1933	Germany	540,000	110,000
October	1937	Dantzic	10,000	250
March	1938	Austria	190,000	19,500
October	1938	Czechoslovakia	357,000	64,500
September	1939	Poland	3,300,000	1,600,000
April	1940	Denmark	8,000	
April	1940	Norway	2,000	800
May	1940	Holland	180,000	45,000
May	1940	Belgium-Luxemburg	85,000	30,000
June	1940	Italy	57,000	
June	1940	France	300,000	56,000
October	1940	Greece	75,000	18,500
November	1940	Hungary	400,000	
November	1940	Rumania	850,000	227,500
February	1941	Bulgaria	50,000	
April	1941	Yugoslavia	75,000	35,000
June	1941	U.S.S.R. (occupied part)	2,000,000	650,000
June	1941	Baltic States	245,000	173,000
			8,724,000	3,030,050

Table I attempts to give a summary of Hitler's calendar of attack and conquest since 1933 and of the distribution of the 8,724,000 Jews who became his victims as he invaded country after country. Behind every date and each country lies a terrible story of human misery and sufferings. The time of introducing the various measures may differ from country to country, the system is the same, repeated with monotonous precision:

Depriving the Jews of civil rights and enforcing upon them the wearing of yellow badges.

Elimination of the Jews from economic life by laws of Aryani-sation, then robbing them of all their possessions; segregating the Jews in ghettos, labour and concentration camps, exposing them to torture, deportation and diseases; deportation of the Jews to special camps for extermination.

Not all the countries mentioned in column 2 were immediately occupied. In Italy, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria the date of their entry into the war on the side of Germany marks the beginning of increased pressure upon the Jewish population, later the whole undiluted Nazi system was enacted. In 1943 a report of the International Labour Office¹ estimated the number of Jews amongst the 30 to 40 million displaced people in Europe as 4 million. This figure is already out of date, because of the 8,724,000 Jews given in column 3 not less than about 8 million have lost their homes; of the remainder about 800,000 are in Hungary and the Hungarian-occupied parts of Czechoslovakia and Rumania. At the time of writing, the "enviable" situation of the Jews under Hungarian rule too has changed and the deportation trains to Poland, the great slaughter-house of the Nazis, are already running. Does one grasp the meaning and significance of 8 million people driven from their homes? If you think of the whole population of London, or all the men, women and children from Belgium, and try to imagine that they have been forced to leave their homes and all their belongings and have been driven into an unknown exile, it may be easier to understand the meaning of these figures. But the inclusion of the Jews in the homelessness of the displaced peoples is only of statistical value, because if we take column 4 we see that 3,030,050 were already considered dead at the beginning of 1943. This figure given by the Institute for Jewish Affairs, New York,² is an estimate based on various documents. Even if an overestimate

¹ *The Displacement of Population in Europe*, by Eugene M. Kulischer. Montreal, 1943.

² *Hitler's Ten-Year War on the Jews*. New York, 1943.

at the time of publication—the beginning of 1943—there can be no doubt that to-day it is far behind actual facts and at least one more million dead will have to be added to the 1943 figure. If we compare the 1943 figure with the losses of life in all the Allied armies together with the exception of the Russians, we find that already this figure is considerably higher, not including the Jews in the Russian armies who also contributed their fair share. And how did they die? The wealth of details published during the past two years answers this question. Those who refuse to believe that human beings can sink so low as the reported atrocities suggest, will perhaps never be convinced, but those who followed events, endeavouring to understand the Jewish tragedy enacted before their eyes, will know that the facts given by Sir Neville Henderson after leaving Germany are true, and far from propagandistic exaggeration, as are the many declarations by the Allied nations, and statements made by President Roosevelt, Mr. Churchill, the Foreign Secretaries of the U.S.A. and Great Britain. The many reports published in the free Press, telling of Jews suffocated in sealed trucks, electrocuted in death chambers, shot naked by machine-gun fire, burned alive in barracks and synagogues, digging their own graves and being buried alive and many more such outrages, are based on documentary evidence. There are many eye-witnesses who have escaped only to tell the tale, too often did the Nazis themselves boast about making “*judenrein*” one city after another, one country after another. Much information is available about tortures in concentration camps, about intentional starvation¹ methods by giving Jews only one quarter of the meagre war rations and by depriving them of all the essential protective and vitamin foods. There is if required detailed proof of the fate that overtook millions of Jews. But it seems that human language is too weak a medium to describe the tortures, the sufferings and humiliations which millions had to undergo. The available facts will provide historians of coming generations with ample material for convincing mankind of what will be the results, if persecutions of defenceless minorities are treated as internal affairs of states, and not considered as the responsibility of every human being and a crime to humanity as a whole.

To avoid misunderstandings and to indicate the approximate size of the Jewish problem after this war, we have to add here information about those Jews who were fortunate enough to escape from the Nazis.

¹ *Starvation Over Europe, A Documented Record.* Institute for Jewish Affairs, New York, 1943.

TABLE II.

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF JEWISH IMMIGRANTS, REFUGEES AND EVACUEES,
1933-43, WHO ESCAPED FROM THE NAZIS AND WERE ACCEPTED IN
VARIOUS COUNTRIES.

Country	Estimated number of accepted Jews
U.S.S.R.	1,930,000
U.S.A.	170,000
Palestine	220,000
South American Republics	52,000
South Africa	8,000
Canada	9,000
Other overseas countries	50,000
Great Britain	50,000
Switzerland	30,000
Sweden	12,000
Portugal, Spain, Morocco	2,000
Liberated Italy	4,000
Other Refugee countries	25,000
Total	2,562,000

Table II estimates the numbers of all the Jews who, since 1933, entered the various countries of safety as immigrants, refugees, or, as in the case of the Jews from Western Russia, as war evacuees. The 2,562,000 Jews have lost their homes, and nearly all their possessions, but they are in safety and free from the daily danger of being delivered into the hands of the Nazi hangmen. For many of them the difficulties will begin when the war comes to an end.

IX

The Nazi propaganda machine tried to convince the world that this war is a Jewish war. Here at least they are speaking the truth. It is a Jewish war in the sense that the Jewish people were their first victims and have suffered more than any other nation. It is therefore clear that the attitude of the Jews towards the present war is entirely different from that prevalent in 1914-18, when the sympathies were divided in accordance with their national allegiance.

This war is a war of good against evil, of freedom against tyranny, of hope against despair. It is a crusade against the most evil forces ever encountered. There is no question any longer to

which side the Jews belong, they stand to a man as the staunch supporters of the Allied cause. The Allied war is their war. More than 1,500,000 Jews are fighting with the Allied armies. Everywhere is the percentage of the Jews in the armies higher than their percentage in the population. In countries like Canada and South Africa, where conscription has not been introduced, Jewish men and women volunteered beyond expectation. Jewish refugees who escaped from the Nazi hell volunteered in France, in England, in the U.S.A. and wherever they were accepted, in considerable number. But the participation of the Jews is not limited to the fighting armies. They are members of all the guerrilla groups in the various countries; they are an active element in the underground movements of Europe, and, unarmed and helpless as they were in the ghettos and concentration camps in Poland, they took up the battle against the Nazi armies; the battle of Warsaw and of many other ghettos in Poland will remain a shining example of human courage and endurance when the history of this war is being written. A special chapter of this history will have to be devoted to the efforts of the young Jewish community of Palestine to be permitted to participate in the war in a Jewish fighting force. They did not succeed, but their efforts forced the reluctant British authorities to accept many more Jewish volunteers than they were at first prepared to accept. They played their part in the great success of the Allied armies in the North African campaign; they were to be found on all the fronts from Abyssinia to Crete. The Jewish community in Palestine converted the country into a great arsenal for the Allied armies, and although they are still not recognised as one of the Allied nations, they constitute the "nameless Ally," contributing not less than any other recognised ally towards the cause of Allied nations.

X

Preparations for post-war immediate relief for the liberated people and for constructive reparations of the injustices committed by the Nazis during all these years are progressing. Every nation which suffered under Nazi tyranny is engaged in the planning of the future of their national existence. For Hitler can exterminate millions of Poles, hundreds of thousands of Czechs, tens of thousands of Dutchmen and Belgians, but he cannot destroy nations as such, he cannot destroy their countries. There will always be a Polish nation and a Czech nation as there will be many others. The land in which they were born, the soil they have cultivated, will

remain and one day there will rise once more a free nation, to live and work in a free country. The free men of the world give them courage and strength to endure the persecution and the brutalities under which they are suffering to-day, to prepare for the day when the enslaved people of Europe will stand up for the last and final blow against the Nazis and the Quislings in their midst.

For the Jews, however, there is no such future. For the Jews whose losses amount to millions of men, women and children, whose means of existence have been completely destroyed and whose remnants will be found herded together in concentration camps, prisons and in caves, the question of rehabilitation and of rebuilding of their lives is infinitely harder than for all the others. In passing through this present agony little is left to the Jews but hope, a hope which unites them with all the suffering people that this war will result in the building of a new world in which preparations for another war and brutal attacks against the weaker states will be banned for ever, of a world in which an international body will be able to prevent any new Hitler or Mussolini from driving millions of people to death; a body strong enough to prevent any further crime against helpless minorities; powerful enough to regard brutalities against citizens of a state on account of origin, race, creed or culture no longer an internal affair of the majority, but the concern of all those who will be responsible for law and order in the world in general.

As far as their own fate is concerned, millions of Jews are living in the hope that the men who are going to decide the future of the world will not forget the tragic situation of the Jews as a people, and that they will be entitled to participate in the decisions of their own future, that full economic, cultural and political equality will be given to them, that they will be included as equal partners in the great work of relief and reconstruction wherever Jews have suffered and may be found alive. Above all they hope that the causes at the root of their sufferings, the two-thousand-years old curse of homelessness, will at last be removed and that the free nations of the world will grant that "Palestine be established as a Jewish Commonwealth integrated in the structure of the new and democratic world."¹

¹ From a Resolution passed in Jerusalem by the Council of the Zionist Organisation, 10th of November, 1942.

The Jew in the World of the Future

By

EDWARD HULTON

THE place of the Jew in society has been one of the chief problems of the world for many centuries; it is certainly one of the main problems to-day, and one which will have to be boldly faced and, if possible, overcome at the coming peace.

Most non-Jews rather idly accept the existence of such a problem, and they do not very frequently trouble themselves about its causes. It is certainly not easy to decide what are the reasons for the long persecution of this people; neither is this the place to embark upon a full account of its history. Nevertheless, unless a reasonable study is made of the past it is impossible to reach conclusions of any value for the future.

Jewish history falls actually into two nearly equal parts: the dividing line falling at about the period of Christ, or the destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans a generation after his death. During the first period—that is, during the nineteen centuries before the Christian Era—the Jews constituted one of the many lesser nationalities of the Near East. According to the ancient records, the Jews have always been a small people; but they have been a “peculiar” people, having their own kind of civilisation, their own culture, their own laws, their own literature, and their own unique form of religion, amidst a weltering and oppressive mass of larger peoples. This is the story of the Old Testament. The Jews are seen cleaving to their own ideals, despite the pressure of bigger nations; they are seen carried off into captivity by the Babylonians, yet still maintaining their own religion and laws. More than once they are dispersed. Finally, in the year A.D. 70, the City of Jerusalem is levelled to the ground by Titus, and they are dispersed all over the world. In Judea there had been a long and sanguinary struggle between this people and their Roman overlords. The Romans had been successful in uniting almost all the nations of the known world within their peace. The Jews they could not bring in; this almost entirely on grounds of religion. The Jews were not willing to offer sacrifice to the image of a deified Emperor. Conciliation and force were equally vain. It is certainly worth remembering how during these last years

of their existence as a nation the Jews were unwilling to compromise over a principle, and were willing to fight. In the year 66 they broke out into open rebellion, and the Emperor Nero sent two of his best generals, Vespasian and Titus, against them. There was fighting for a year in Galilee before it was reduced. In the end a trench was dug round Jerusalem. On one occasion the defenders broke out of the city, and the legions of Titus were compelled to retreat. Even after Titus had built a great wall round the city, and cut off the defenders from all food, there was no surrender. The faith of the Jews is even said to have been so intense that some of the Roman legionaries joined their cause. At last the Romans broke in, slaying until they were exhausted, and burning the city to the ground. More than a million Jews are said to have died in the great siege. Of those who were not killed, 97,000 were enslaved. A triumphal arch was erected in Rome. It stands to this day. So does part of the old wall at Jerusalem. But the Romans have passed away and the Jews remain. (Though it is true that the traditions and influence of Rome still exist). Even with the destruction of Jerusalem the fighting did not end; and the Zealots continued to defy Rome from small inaccessible fortresses. Then came the last rebellion, caused by the desire of the Emperor Hadrian to build a new Temple, dedicated not to the God of Israel but to Jupiter. This rebellion, under Bar-Kochba, was not put down for three years. After it was over, part of the land was distributed to the Roman soldiers and the remainder sold at auction. Jerusalem was renamed Aelia Capitolina, and on its gate was impaled a pig's head. All Jews were forbidden to enter "for all time." Only on the ninth day of the month of Ab, the anniversary of the destruction of the Temple, were they permitted to approach the city. On that day they might come to the wall and weep at its desolation. Even then they were compelled to bribe the sentries not to molest them; they had to "buy their tears." Thus in A.D. 135 the Galeth, the dreadful exile, began. The Jews never took up arms again. The Scattering, or Diaspora, as it is called, had of course been in process for many centuries, perhaps as early as Solomon. There were many small colonies of traders in strange lands. Certainly there were many such after the destruction of the Northern Kingdom in 722 B.C., and still more after the destruction of the Southern Kingdom in 586 B.C. Some, indeed, say that from 586 B.C. there were always more Jews outside Palestine than within its borders. Until the year 70, however, Jerusalem had been universally recognised as the centre of Jewish life; after this time all the many scattered settlements threatened to go adrift. Had the Jews not possessed a unique

religion, and their holy Law, no doubt they would have been absorbed finally at this period; disappearing like the Phœnicians, the Carthaginians, and the Arameans. The Jewish priests indeed had already become corrupt, and had been deposed from most of their powers. By the time of the fall of the Temple the real power had passed into the hands of the Pharisees, or new interpreters of the law. Their leaders, the Rabbis, or teachers, controlled the Sanhedrin, or assembly of the people; and it was they who now saved the spirit of Israel. Their leader at this time was Jochanan Ben Zakkai, the disciple of the great Pharisee Hillel. It was Hillel who had said that the whole of the law was included in this one verse, "Do not unto thy neighbour that which is hateful unto thee!" After this time the Rabbis throughout the centuries preserved the spirit of Israel. To do so, however, they felt themselves compelled to build a wall of Law around their people; and this wall was lowered only during the last century, about the same time as the opening of the ghettos. Thus the Jews have been kept separate, not only by pressure from without, but by leaders from within.

There can be no manner of doubt that, despite so many persecutions, and despite their comparatively small numbers in the world, the Jews have made, altogether apart from the communal contribution of their religion and their Law, an astonishing number of individual contributions to civilisation in all its periods. Indeed, there are few, if any, fields in which they have not made their mark; in spite of the fact that at most times they have been kept by law, or by custom, from so many activities. It has certainly not taken them long in modern Palestine to prove to the world that they are first-class farmers. In truth, the Jews of the Old Testament were an agricultural people; and the Law forbade, and still forbids, the exaction of extortionate rates of interest. They did not take to moneylending until in the Middle Ages they discovered that this was one of the very few employments permitted to them. A very long list of Jews who hold rank amongst the greatest leaders of mankind could easily be compiled. Perhaps, however, the greatest Jew of all time was Spinoza, one of the world's first philosophers, a man rejected not only by Christians but by his own brethren, owing to his original mind, and his desire to seek only the truth. It is not necessary here to examine whether Christopher Columbus was Jewish; he certainly had many Jewish friends and connections. But it is pleasant to think of him as a Jew, discovering a New World which has become, and should become far more, a new resting place for his people. The Jew has been usually successful where he has been allowed any

chance at all; partly, no doubt, because life for him has been a serious and a hard business from the day of his birth. This very success has, of course, frequently made him all the more unpopular, both amongst the rich and amongst the poor. He has been usually successful. But, probably, he has seldom at any time been very happy, for he has always been an alien; he has never been able to be an integrated part of an organism which could give him the highest balance of character, and evoke his fullest loyalties. Thus, when he has not been too closely integrated into a tiny community of his own, behind the double walls of the ghetto and of the Law, he has tended to become the wrong kind of individualist—the individualist or “free man” who is the individual in isolation, and not in co-operation with a community—the kind of individualist that we have all tended to become since the Renaissance.

The fact, however, that the Jew has remained an alien has been of considerable value to the peoples amongst whom he has dwelt; for it has made him detached, a detached critic. The alien is apt to suffer by the non-integration of his own character; but he can be a valuable corrective of the native. The stimulus provided by refugees in past times, be they Jews or Huguenots, is a fact well known to any who have made any kind of unbiased inquiry. It was the policy of the Tudor governments to establish large numbers of foreign craftsmen in England; and the proportion of foreigners in the country was much greater then than it is to-day. The alien, however, is valuable, not only because he may be the master of a new craft or skill, but just because he is different. He is an education to the native; and where he is a hard and intelligent worker, like the Huguenot or the Jew, he sets new standards of efficiency and performance. He is, in addition to this, as has already been remarked, the critic with a detached mind, able to look upon established institutions in a new way. In no country can this kind of mind be more useful than amongst the English who, despite their many excellencies, are a people unusually prone to complacency and self-satisfaction; a people which is even to-day remarkably isolated from many of the vivifying main streams of thought of the Continent. It would be difficult to compute how much the English have gained by their intimate and, on the whole, friendly contact with the Jews since their re-entry at the time of Cromwell. The English, for an intelligent and roving people, are able to maintain astonishingly little interest in, and learn remarkably little from, foreign peoples, whether by means of travel upon the Continent of Europe or contacts with the marvellously subtle Eastern civilisation of India

(which it looks now as if they are going to say good-bye to, without having taken the opportunity to enrich their minds). The Jews in England, however, the English have not been able to ignore. They may not have always appreciated them; but they have been compelled to extend themselves in order to compete with them in business. From meeting them at school, in business, and in social life they have imbibed some of their Eastern subtlety. English culture is peculiarly suitable for mixture with Eastern culture. It is certain that English literature, and hence English thought, has gained immeasurably through the influence upon it of the Jewish Scriptures. The Bible has given a dignity to the English language, which it has not yet entirely surrendered to the more modern influence of Hollywood. And even should the English language go under completely beneath the flood of transatlantic English speech, to say nothing of "Basic," it will retain figures which have become a completely integral part of its fabric. The Englishman will still catch a bus "by the skin of his teeth." If he remains a member of a great trading power, he will still "go down to the sea in ships, and have his business in great waters." He will still inquire, "can a leopard change its spots?" He will continue to threaten to make his enemies "bite the dust"; reminding them that there is "a pride that goes before a fall," whilst suggesting that his is "the way of an eagle." If the population is not to suffer a still more disastrous fall, there must still be "the way of a man with a maid"; and it is yet to be hoped that his wife will remain "the apple of his eye," and that he will love her with "the love that is strong as death."

The Jew has often been the candid friend; he has frequently, too, been the reformer, and sometimes the violent revolutionary—though it would only be showing one side of the medal to depict the Jew as revolutionary; for the Jewish way of life in itself is patently conservative. And where the Jews have been allowed to settle comfortably, they have often acquired exceedingly conservative characteristics. If the Jews were revolutionary in the old Russia, they tend to be conservative, and more useful, extremely law-abiding and non-violent in England. It has been truly remarked that "a country gets the Jews it deserves." It is certainly worthy of note that the great Conservative leader of the Victorian age, the Earl of Beaconsfield, was a Jew.

The story of the last dispersion and of Christendom, lasting until our own day, has undoubtedly been one of martyrdom for the Jewish people—though martyrdom with differing degrees of intensity. It is not at all simple to discern the causes. The most extreme

opponents of the Jews are the last who can provide any rational or other convincing reason for their demeanour and behaviour.

Have the Jews been persecuted owing to their "race"? Human beings have recurrently manifested a disposition to hate men of a different "race"; though this has not by any means always been the case. In fact, all the "races" in the world to-day are "impure." Julian Huxley, in his *We Europeans*, explains the present position. Possibly all peoples derived originally from a single "race." Very likely branches of this single "race" became isolated in the various parts of the world, and developed varying characteristics. All this must be surmise, for the facts are not known. What is known, is that at the earliest times of which there are still records these "races," if they were ever separate, had become inextricably mixed together. Although broad distinctions can obviously be drawn between whites, yellows, browns and blacks, yet all these are to some extent mixed with the other "races." All Europeans have some strains of yellow, brown, and even black. There are said to be three main "races" inside Europe: the Nordics, the Mediterraneans, and the Alpines; though ethnologists differ endlessly over nomenclature. However, according to Huxley, all the nations of Europe are made up of roughly equal proportions of these three "races." Even the term "white man" is undoubtedly unscientific. Most of the countries of Western Europe seem to possess a substratum of a dark, or Iberian race, which once held the field. The short dark men of Scotland, Ireland and, above all, Wales and Cornwall, are supposed to belong to it. Are these men white? The question is idle. It is also worth remembering that the "Indo-European race," now inhabiting India and Europe, came from Central Asia; the English, moreover, are the descendants of the Teutonic tribes who came into Europe at the time of the fall of the Roman Empire. It should also be realised that the Jews have been in Europe a very long time. The Jews in the Rhineland of Germany were there before the arrival of the Germans!

Actually the "racial" objection to the Jew is, on the whole, comparatively recent. For in the Middle Ages the Jew was accepted, if he was willing to become a Christian or Muslim; the Muslims on the whole being a great deal more tolerant if he insisted on retaining his own religion. Which is a reason why so many Jews remained in the East during the Middle Ages, or fled thither during the persecutions in Spain, only to return again to the West about the end of the eighteenth century; and no doubt why so many still retain such an Eastern demeanour. It is Hitler who proclaims that even if the Jew gives up his beliefs he remains a Jew—an

argument which could not be sustained in the absence of the entire edifice of Nazi "race theory," a theory which is known to all scientists to be without any foundation, and which is not worth a moment's argument. Of course it cannot be argued that because "race theories" are unsound therefore all men are uniform. He who runs may see for himself that all men are very far from being the same; an Englishman is not even very like a Frenchman. There are such things as different *cultures*. The Jews *are* different, and their difference is mainly cultural. We should not, however, be intolerant of those whose cultures differ from our own.

Have the Jews been persecuted because of their different physical features? To some extent this is no doubt the case. Jewish culture has given them, to a certain degree, a common facial expression. It is, however, possible to make many mistakes in this direction. Closer inspection reveals at once that there does not exist a *single* Jewish type. Jews are not all of the same "race." There are also a number of varying groups; the Sephardim, or Spanish Jews, being quite unlike the Askhenazim, or Jews from Germany. A great deal must be put down to sheer imagination on the part of the non-Jew. He carries very often an idea of the Jewish face in his own mind, and does not trouble to observe whether the actual Jews he encounters conform to it. In the same way, it could be said that the non-American carries in his mind a picture of the American, whom he conceives of as a tall, lantern-jawed individual, somewhat resembling Abraham Lincoln. Statistics, however, prove that the average American is short and rather plump. The English, indeed, think of the American girl as being a slim creature with essentially long legs. But the American WAACS who have come to work over here are almost remarkably squat, certainly much less tall and slim than the average English girl in uniform. The Jew, of course, though not a member of one type is, as a rule, a little different from the ordinary citizen, though the difference is frequently one which he, or his ancestors, have acquired from sojourn in another country—not Palestine. The Jew thus seems unfortunately nearly always a foreigner; and this to the intolerant is inexcusable.

There is little doubt that the Jew was persecuted in the Middle Ages mainly owing to his religion. This certainly was the official excuse. Under the Catholic Church the Jews were subjected to the rigours of the Holy Office of the Inquisition. At first Luther had nothing but praise for their age-long resistance to the Church. In an essay, "Jesus was born a Jew," he wrote: "We must exercise not the law of the Pope but that of Christian love." It seems, however,

that these amiable words were the fruit of his desire to convert the Jews. When they would not be converted, he did not hesitate to accuse them of all the fictitious crimes which had put the people against them throughout the Middle Ages. He alleged that they poisoned wells, murdered their Christian patients, and killed children, to get blood for their Passover. He called upon the princes to persecute them without mercy; and upon the preachers to stir up the people against them. If the power were his, he declared, he would take all their leaders and tear their tongues out by the roots! Nor were all the leading figures of the eighteenth century "Enlightenment" by any means kindly disposed. The Emperor Joseph II, however, passed in 1782 the Edict of Toleration, which abolished the wearing of the special badge by Jews; in 1791 revolutionary France abolished all the laws directed against them. Napoleon adopted a policy of appeasement towards them. The defeat of his Empire meant in many cases the restoration of the ghetto; the ghetto of Rome was not closed until 1870.

Difference of religion has undoubtedly remained a subconscious cause for the dislike of Jews in our own time. Children are taught at an impressionable age that the Jews crucified Christ. The mistaken education of children still remains a powerful factor.

The Jews, of course, as has been said, do not constitute a race but a culture. And as a culture they have often been disliked because they are different.

The dislike which they have had to endure is also connected with what may be termed caste—that is, they have been associated with certain occupations. It is true that in their original state they were agriculturists; but the penal laws of the medieval world confined them to one or two occupations, and not those occupations which were held in the highest esteem. Usually during the Middle Ages moneylending, and also the retail trade in old clothes, were the only occupations allowed to them. Further, these occupations were not only considered evil or degrading in themselves; the business of moneylending was naturally inclined to make the lenders highly unpopular with the borrowers. Associated too with this caste, or occupational, distinction was a conception of class, and during ages when rank and class counted for very much. The Jews were certainly not "noble"; and even the "non-noble" could persuade themselves that the Jew belonged to a still inferior class. Hitler has been able to make use of this feeling; especially owing to the extreme weakness of the Germans for distinctions of class and rank.

Another characteristic of the Jews of a class description was the

fact that they did not fight. They were in ancient times an extremely courageous people. The fact, however, remains that, after the destruction of their city in A.D. 70, they only twice resorted to arms again in defence of their rights.¹ Neither did they flock to the banners of other peoples, like such bellicose exiles as the Irish or the Jacobite Scots. There is no doubt that the ordinary human being feels that the fighting man is superior to the non-fighter, especially in times of war. It is only necessary to look around at the attitude adopted towards the humblest soldier to-day. To observe this closely is to understand the Middle Ages, and the glamour which once attached to "*noblesse*," a glamour which is only just fading away. In this prestige the Jews did not have a part.

These causes for the unpopularity of the Jews have been examined at some length, because it is certain that only through a proper study of them can understanding be reached concerning conduct for the future, for Jew and non-Jew alike.

It needs to be emphasised that anti-Semitism is a psychological problem. Since the discoveries of Freud—himself a Jew—and the later work of Adler and Jung, we know more about psychology and about man's long-unsuspected subconscious mind; and this new knowledge will be of immeasurable value in combating such diseases of the human spirit as anti-Semitism. One of the chief lessons that is learned from a study of psychology is that man is exceedingly inclined to the creation of scapegoats. He creates these scapegoats which he blames when things go wrong. Again, man still retains many of the undesirable desires of his remote ancestors; he possesses a subconscious wish to kill and to hurt. However, he imagines to himself that it is his neighbour who wishes to hurt him! Thus thousands have given way to the belief that the Jews are in some way plotting to harm them. An example of this is the belief still cherished by the majority of Englishmen, even by those who are far from having any real dislike of the Jew, that Jewish interests control the main financial organisation of this country. This is quite untrue. The Jews are, in fact, poorly represented amongst the first-class financial houses of the country. But the ordinary citizen is not at all easy to argue out of this ingrained belief. Behind it lies the thought that if high finance were not being manipulated in some way by the Jews he himself would be making more money.

The Jew has perhaps been the most frequently used scapegoat in the world. It should, however, be understood that the Jew is not the

¹ The last great rebellion against the Romans was in 135 A.D. In 614 A.D. there was rebellion of the Jews in Palestine under Persian rule.

only scapegoat. In fact, it is essential for the Jews to understand that they are not the only people, or class, that has been persecuted in the past, or is being persecuted to-day; otherwise they will themselves tend to suffer from persecution complexes. A casual glance, even, back into history reveals almost numberless peoples who have been the victims of persecution by their rivals. In fact, the Israelites themselves in Old Testament times were intolerant of their neighbours. There is also some danger that after this war the so-called "German race" will become another universal scapegoat. This would be a disaster for two reasons. In the first place, the creation of this new scapegoat would divert attention from the fundamental spiritual and economic ills of world society, and from the beam which is in our own eye. It would also be thoroughly unhealthy for ourselves, and a mere giving way to paranoic tendencies. Further, the Jews, whilst naturally condemning the Nazis and all their works, ought to take the lead in refusing to countenance an idea which would be unjust, and wholly unscientific and mistaken. By a refusing to yield to sentiments of revenge, the Jews will have an opportunity to ennoble themselves for all time. In any event, no one can outdo the Nazis in brutality, so it is better not to enter the competition. We ought to show ourselves not as like, but as unlike the Nazis as possible. And it was Christ, himself a Jew, who taught that we should indeed hate the sin, but not the sinner. Hatred is not a feeling which we should encourage in our hearts. It must be that, owing to their centuries-long persecution, many Jews feel hatred. Psychologists, however, insist that it is the part of the weak to hate. The British, who have so long known security, are amongst the least willing to hate. The student of military affairs will also readily agree that the best soldiers do not hate their opponents. If the Jews are to enter into the joint heritage of mankind they must make a supreme gesture, and appreciate the real force not of hate but of love.

It is also to be hoped that the Japanese people are also not going to succeed to the role of scapegoat. Many Americans, indeed, nourish very foolish feelings about the Japanese, calling them "little yellow devils," and quite forgetting that we are fighting this war to divest ourselves of all racial distinctions, and that in any case the majority of the yellow men live within the borders of our ally, China.

The Jews will indeed feel less inferiority complex if they recall European intolerance of the so-called coloured peoples, none of whom are probably congenitally inferior to the inhabitants of Europe, and the scorn felt until very recent years of the Chinese, certainly one of the world's best and most civilised peoples.

In passing, it is useful to consider the gross intolerance which has in the immediate past been meted out even to the Gypsies who, like the Jews, have long been dispersed and dwellers amongst Western peoples. Up till about a hundred years ago in England sexual intercourse with a Gypsy was punishable by death.

Not to embark upon the long history of minorities, it remains only to call to mind the Armenians, scattered amongst the Ottoman dominions; and the Copts of Egypt, who, though of similar race to their fellow Egyptians, are still discriminated against, for reasons of their Christian religion, and also, like the Jews, because they have long been traders and moneylenders. It would even be desirable to remember the unfortunate Assyrians. This unfortunate people is Christian; yet the Christians of other lands have refused them entrance. Such is man's inhumanity to man!

The tendency to create scapegoats is certainly always present in men's minds. And not only peoples, but also social classes, have at different times had to fill this tragic role. At the present juncture, indeed, there is even some danger that the workers may make the so-called upper classes into a new scapegoat. They are already apt to blame them, or the "capitalist system"—a theoretical scapegoat this time—for all the ills to which man is heir. The creation of scapegoats is a triple tragedy. For the wrongly accused people suffer; the true causes of the trouble are not examined; and the accusers inhibit themselves from taking any action, or from improving their own condition.

Is anti-Semitism growing in Britain to-day? It is growing somewhat at the moment. After the war, nevertheless, with the defeat of Nazidom, there is every chance that it will gradually disappear altogether from the world. It has increased slightly in this country of late for several reasons. In the first place, Hitler denounced the Jews. And though the Nazis are our enemies, yet a certain amount of what Hitler said must have stuck. Hitler has certainly made the ordinary man more conscious of the fact that there are Jews about, and that they are different from the average citizen. And he has given some kind of official sanction to the type of mind which always harboured these thoughts. In addition, some of the Jewish refugees have upset the British people. A few of them have not been of a very desirable type; and they have set going again the persecution mania of the badly educated that their jobs are going to be taken away from them by the arrival of competitors from abroad. Lastly, war produces very strong feelings of patriotism, which sometimes degenerate into a narrow nationalism. The citizens look round to see if the

“foreigners” in their midst are really making as big a war effort as they think they are making themselves. The question is suddenly put, “How many Jews are there in the Navy?”

One of the most fantastic examples of up-to-date anti-Semitism is the recently formed “Medical Policy Association,” which is not only opposing State medicine—but “Jewish Fascism” [*sic*]—“international financial control by the Jews”!

What should be done to combat this evil? First by non-Jews. At the moment the measures that can be taken to help the tortured millions in occupied Europe are limited. More, however, should be done to get the Jews out of Nazi control and into safe dwellings. Enough energy, humanity and imagination have not gone into this work; neither has official red tape been sufficiently circumvented. Without prejudice to the very difficult case of Palestine, there should never have been the spectacle of ships arriving off the coast of that country and being turned away. These unfortunate people should undoubtedly have been accommodated somewhere. The Swedish Government has recently honoured itself by its free admission of Jews from Denmark.

More important, however, than even this work of mercy is a permanent settlement of the problem once the Nazi persecutors are defeated. (In the meantime, it should be possible to suggest to the Germans that the treatment that they will receive after the war will be a good deal worse if they continue their present inhuman practices. The Allies now possess a new weapon, since most Germans now realise that they cannot win the war.)

There is first the problem of the actual physical settlement of the Jews. Many will no doubt never wish to return to Germany. Britain, moreover, should inform such countries as Poland and Rumania that at no time can they countenance any victimisation of the Jewish people.

Zionism is a cause of disputation even amongst Jews themselves. It is impossible not to sympathise with the desire of many Jews to have “their own country” in Palestine. Many people indeed believe that this is the only practical permanent solution. I personally do not agree with this, for several reasons. In the first place, it is a counsel of despair, and admits that the Jews are a separate people, to the extent that they can never expect real equality from other peoples. It is also a nationalist solution, in a period when nationalism has become discredited—by the patent failure of Wilson’s theory of self-determination—and by Hitler’s own activities as much as by anything else! Palestine, moreover, is infinitely too small, and

meagre in resources, ever to become a genuine independent state. Even existing small nations such as Belgium—or Syria, or Lebanon, which are other Near-Eastern States struggling for birth—have no future whatsoever, except in association with a larger group. Beyond all this, the Arabs *exist* in Palestine. This happens to be a fact, which cannot be argued away. It is doubtful if a wrong to one people can be put right by committing any kind of wrong against another people, especially a third party not responsible for the original injustice.

This is certainly not to say that the Jews should not possess many institutions of their own in Palestine, or colonise the country to a considerable extent. Palestine will have to remain a part of the British Commonwealth, or of some other large association. Within Palestine, however, there is a great deal to be said for a "cantonal" system, such as has been so successful in the Swiss Confederation. Under this system there would be districts controlled entirely by Jews, who would have the opportunity to prove to the world their very considerable powers of organisation, and their capacity for good government and justice.

Turning to other lands in which the Jews might settle after the war, there is no reason why some of the refugees of the war should not remain in the United Kingdom. The distinction surely lies between those refugees from Nazi peril, be they Jews or non-Jews, who are individually undesirable, as against those who would make good new citizens. There is no reason why Britain should harbour any person, from any race or country, once the war is over, who is not in himself a desirable person. But, as has been previously suggested, the better type of immigrant is a considerable asset. It is also becoming realised that labour is one of the two sources of national wealth. Britain, moreover, is in grave danger of a materially reduced population.

If a similar standpoint is adopted by other countries there will be plenty of places for the Jews to go to. They are said to have numbered only 15,800,000 in 1930 in the entire world, and they have been tragically reduced by the Nazis. The United States might well adopt a more liberal immigration policy altogether, realising at last that their restriction of immigration in more recent years is not unconnected with the recent ferment in Italy and the rise of Fascism. Perhaps the recent action of President Roosevelt in urging the repeal of legislation prohibiting the immigration, or even transit, of Chinese is a sign of better things. One of the most suitable areas for Jewish immigration must surely be the "semi-Mediterranean"

continent of Latin America, although there has recently been discrimination against the Jews in the Argentine. Brazil is the most suitable of these Latin American countries. She has first-class natural resources, and could become a first-class power, with a population of 150 million—some say 300 million—whilst at present she has but forty. Everything is all set for progress in Brazil, except the lassitude of its people. They are certainly amongst the most charming of all peoples; but, possibly owing to the heat, they are not energetic. The country would never tolerate control from without, even from the United States; and the only long-term solution would be to settle the country with more energetic inhabitants who would of course become patriotic Brazilians. Is it too fantastic to imagine a future United States of Brazil conducted largely by Jews and Scotsmen? It is certainly an important consideration that the Brazilians are not merely easy-going but genuinely tolerant. Racial barriers are unknown, a fact which places them in at least one respect ahead of the U.S.A.

That Australia is almost empty, and thus in additional peril, has long been obvious to the schoolboy; though it has not apparently been equally obvious to the Australians themselves, especially to the Trade Unions, until recently. Mr. Curtin, the Prime Minister, is now rightly calling for a closer union of the whole British Commonwealth, in which Australia would find augmented strength. She will, however, also need greatly to increase her population. Since she is desirous of not admitting too many Asiatics, the immigration of Jews and other Europeans seems indicated. New Zealand has never had a counterpart of the White Australia Policy; but, although her area is nearly as great as that of Japan, which houses nearly ninety million people, whilst she herself has only about two million, she is considered by most people to be very nearly full up, owing to the prevalence of great mountain ranges. New Zealand would, nevertheless, be a very pleasant new home for the immigrant. She is not only the most socially advanced country in the world, putting the United Kingdom to shame by having had her own Beveridge Plan for at least ten years, but she provides an example of unusual tolerance. The Maoris, who a century ago were chivalrous but cannibalistic, now enjoy complete equality, with four Members of Parliament of their own—a fair proportion for their numbers. They constitute a striking example of the rise of a race to which toleration has been accorded, having in late years produced a number of really eminent men, including the head of a great scientific institution in Hawaii. Australia could accommodate untold millions more

people; it has recently been worked out by the Australian authorities that the island continent could take twenty millions, even without any further irrigation; at present she has only seven. Her problems of defence without a bigger population do not require much emphasis; she is handicapped not only by the small number of people but by an immensely large territory. If the *Queen Mary* were to set sail from Sydney and proceed round the coast, after four weeks she would not be back in port.

The permanent solution of the Jewish problem, of course, can only come with fundamental improvement of the mentality of the world. It is a commonplace of liberal and democratic theory that persecution and intolerance are never justified. Since man is so imperfect surely no individual, or group, has the right to impose its theories and way of life rigidly upon others. It seemed indeed by the beginning of this century that the persecution of the Jews belonged to the horrors of the past, like the "Iron Maiden" of Nuremberg. Our recent failure to prevent a new flood of intolerance in the world has been largely due to our too exclusive reliance on strictly rationalist theories, ignoring the equally important realm of the emotions. It is not merely necessary to convince ourselves *intellectually* that we ought not to discriminate against minorities—a task in which most of us have long ago succeeded—we *must not want to do so*. This calls for an understanding, and then a schooling and directing, of human emotions.

The task of governments, of the Press, and of other agencies, in opposing anti-Semitism, though both necessary and urgent, is none the less highly difficult, and not to be entered upon lightly, requiring as it does an infinitely subtle and refined approach. Anything in the nature of blunt orders or exhortations to the under-educated to cease from feeling anti-Semitic would probably produce the very opposite effect. Even to make it an offence to advocate racial discrimination might well merely create additional underground and concealed feelings of the most undesirable character, which might one day generate a further explosion. It is not desirable that the citizens should get the impression that the Jews are in any sense a special people with special protection. For this reason the Jews must be prepared to receive their share of reasonable criticism like every other section of the community. Actually, one of the factors which caused the ordinary people in the Middle Ages to dislike the Jews was that, for financial and other convenient reasons, they were supposed to enjoy the special protection of the Crown.

Non-Jews, furthermore, can only win half the battle; the Jews

must be active to save themselves. Well-established Jews in Britain and the United States have sometimes been shocked by the demeanour of recent arrivals from Europe. Whilst they should not turn aside from the succour of their more unfortunate brethren, they should exert themselves to the full to keep their people up to the highest standards. A powerful new Jewish organisation is surely required for this purpose; and it should spare no effort to check the activities of the less satisfactory elements. It should, in fact, be a kind of self-disciplinary body, like the Law Society.

There is no gainsaying that complaints are sometimes made that too many Jews are seen congregated together in expensive places of entertainment. One of the lesser activities of this new society might be to request their members to show reasonable restraint in these matters. Whilst so many thousands of Jewish people are being done to death in lethal chambers in occupied Europe, and whilst so many ordinary citizens are feeling the financial burdens of the war, dancing or dining in a luxury hotel can be misunderstood. More important would be pressure to the end that ethical standards, whether in the professions or in business, are not lowered by the new arrivals from the Continent. Above all, the society would encourage its members, putting aside both bitterness and feelings of inferiority, to take their rightful place in the nation in the most dignified possible way.

Whilst the ideal is a world state, there is no likelihood of its coming in the immediate future. In the meantime, the Jews must decide upon the most meticulous observation of the social contract of that nation of which they are citizens.

The fear has sometimes been expressed that toleration would kill the Jewish faith. Whilst probably many Jews in the better days to come will be absorbed into other religions, or philosophical communions, if the Law has within itself important elements of truth it will always have its adherents. It will have to take its chance with other faiths, all of which will be in some danger of being killed by kindness, or mere materialism.

The problem of the Jew should not be looked upon as a special problem. It is part and parcel of the evolution of all mankind from ignorance, superstition, cruelty and violence. Education alone can solve it. Not mere academic or technical education. Not more mechanical progress. The mechanical progress in which such writers as H. G. Wells so greatly glory has been contemporaneous not only with improvement in medicine but with the blackest period of Jewish persecution, and of wounds to the human spirit which no

physician can heal. Not more intellectualism and rationalism; the excess of rationalism in France has brought her to her nadir. What is required is a new education of the spirit. When it has been learned that the highest law is co-operation one with another, and men have appreciated the surprising fact that hatred is a less powerful force than love, then the Jew will have honour amongst men. Not a mere district in the Levant, but, at long last, the whole world will be his Promised Land.

The Problem of Assimilation

By

PROFESSOR HYMAN LEVY

IT is impossible to define a Jew and it is futile to attempt to do so in a few sentences. There is no uniform religious test that can be applied; there is no uniform biological test, no uniform sociological, linguistic or cultural test. All Jews do not believe in Judaism, for, like their non-Jewish neighbours, some are agnostic and some are atheist, some are even Christian and Catholic like many of those who have been driven from Germany and Austria during the past decade. Even those who profess Judaism, again like their Christian neighbours, differ very widely in their interpretation of what constitutes the essentials of the Jewish faith.

There is no Jewish racial type. Some are black-haired—straight or curly—some are fair and some red-haired. Some are large-nosed, some small-nosed, some aquiline, and some snub-nosed; some are round-faced, fat and chubby, some long-faced and lean; some are high-cheekboned and Mongolian in appearance, and some swarthy, almost indistinguishable from Italians and Arabs. There are Jewish Americans, Russians, Poles, Frenchmen, Germans, Italians, Spaniards, Greeks, Turks, Egyptians, Palestinians, Chinese, Indians, Englishmen and Scotsmen, almost the same as their non-Jewish fellow countrymen.

The first characteristic of Jewry, therefore, that manifests itself is diversity in type and habitation. Jews live, or have lived, in every European country, in North and South America, in Asia, Africa and Australia—and wherever they live they speak the language of the country, live its life, take part in its customs and contribute to its social, scientific, economic and cultural development.

Again, Jews are as class-divided socially as any other people. The majority of the 400,000 Jews in this country live in the East End of London—a proletarian population of cabinet-makers, garment-workers, craftsmen of all types, and petty traders. There are middle-class Jews, Jewish intellectuals, and wealthy business Jews. Socially they are a normal sample of the population.

What is then distinctive about Jewry that it should regard itself, and be regarded, as a separate people? The Jews are an historic phenomenon. They are bound together by a past history

that dates back to the period when, being a nation with a highly-developed culture of their own, they struck back against the might of Rome in a final struggle for national freedom. Their past history reflects itself in their present. That history covers the period of ten centuries of sojourn as isolated families and in communities in North Africa and Feudal Europe. They came to a Europe already occupied and partitioned among its kings and baronial lords, else there might to-day have been a Jewish European State. They had no formal place either as serfs or as barons. They were strangers at the mercy of both, without rights, without legal status of any sort, completely unprotected.

At first sight it seems a strange thing that a people who appeared in Europe almost in dribblets, without the power to protect themselves, strangers and foreigners everywhere, should have survived, in spite of it all, nay, grown and multiplied. The problem has been discussed and debated *ad nauseam*.

It is in the Marxist approach that an intelligible and scientific answer is to be found. For with Marx we begin by asking the simple question, "What social purpose did the Jews fulfil in these early days that worked towards their survival?" Here was a nomadic people—necessarily without roots in the soil, for they belonged nowhere—gathering an experience of peoples and their tongues, their writing and their culture, unrivalled by any others of that period. The fact that they are necessarily strangers everywhere drives them together, accentuates their desire to retain their own private rites and customs and to elevate their history almost to a religious creed. This internal accentuation of their national customs in its turn accentuates their exclusiveness, and underlines their strangeness. The social and economic stratification of feudal Europe thus insisted that they remain a people apart, and they in their turn responded by echoing the insistence.

What function did they perform that enabled them to survive? The obvious role of a nomadic people of this nature, in a Europe that was ready for the interchange of goods, was that of merchants. Already in Palestine there had developed quite a considerable degree of commerce and primitive industry. This is evidenced by the detailed discussions in Rabbinical writings on the ethics of contracts, commercial transactions and the hiring of labour. Culturally and historically, therefore, the Jews had already moved beyond the stage of the Europe into which they wandered. Thus they became the forerunners of the merchant class, and as such played a fundamentally progressive role in bringing the new

Europe of the merchant period into being. As men who understood writing, counting, money, exchange and organisation, they were invaluable to the feudal lords. They became the clerks and the tax-gatherers. As usury was forbidden by the Church (until it was seen to be too profitable to be completely forbidden) they became the moneylenders. In this way their position, distinct from both feudal lord and serf, was sharpened, and in becoming so was converted into a buffer between the two classes. As the Feudal System drew towards its close, as the struggle developed that threw off the fetters of the old order, serfs and feudal lords in their difficulties alike turned on the Jew—the former against the Jew as the tax-gatherer, and therefore as the personification of his oppression and the immediate cause of his misery, the latter against the Jew as his creditor from whom he had borrowed and borrowed as his need increased. Hence it is that the pogroms of the periods of the Crusades, themselves a sign of a period of unsettlement and social dissolution, rank as one of the bloodiest epochs in Jewish history. The Jew, because of the special position in which he found himself in society, became the political pawn in a vast social struggle.

So it has been throughout the ages. So it was in Spain when the Inquisition played its bloody part in Jewish extermination, as an instrument of high political policy. There the position was even more complicated, for the Spain at the end of the fifteenth century was the scene of an internal struggle for unification of its feudal aristocracy, centring around the royal ambitions of Ferdinand and Isabella, and directed towards a final clearing of the peninsula from Moslem rule. It required, therefore, the growth and intensification of Spanish nationalism; but within the framework of that problem were those aroused by the presence of a powerful merchant class. The role of the Church, therefore, was to weld the social and military power of the feudal aristocracy to the financial power of the merchant class, and at the same time to sweep in the peasants and serfs as allies in clearing the peninsula of the Moslems. By this means the Church could consolidate its own position in the unified Spain that would grow out of this struggle; the aristocracy could play its part along with the Church in the new era of exploitation of the ignorant and poverty-stricken peasantry. The Jews, many of whom had attained eminence both in Spanish and in Moslem circles as merchants and as contributors to cultural development, were in an ideal position to be used as the political pawns in this complex struggle. How well the game was played can be seen from the massacres that occurred in town after town of Spain, and from the final

60

expulsion in 1492, the year of the Spanish expedition to America under Columbus. Spain was consolidated, the merchant class, the aristocratic class, and the Church united in the exploitation of the Spanish and South American peasantry on a scale rivalled only under Czarism in Russia. The sequel to that struggle was seen nearly 340 years later in the formation of a Popular Front Government in the Spain of our own time, in the Fascist uprising under Franco with the assistance of Hitler and Mussolini and in the so-called non-intervention policy of the British and French Governments.

If we look back with dispassionate eyes on the history of Spain, and see it, as it clearly is, a struggle of the Spanish people for emancipation from slavery and serfdom, as a fight for liberty and freedom in the development of their resources, against a class that sucked its life-blood, we can also see how deliberate was the plan for using the special position of the Jew as a means of diverting the people from the real and underlying causes of their misery.

This story is repeated throughout history. It was repeated under Czarism every time a social crisis developed, every time there was any danger that Liberalism might raise its head and seek to free itself from the autocratic bonds that bound it. It was easy to persuade the ignorant, illiterate and superstitious Russian peasant, as with the Spanish serf, that the source of all his troubles lay not with his aristocratic oppressors, but with that strange, almost foreign element in their midst, the Jews, segregated and set apart as they were in ghettos. It is easy to see the effect this state of affairs must have had on Jewry, how it would tend to drive them inwards on themselves, accentuate their self-consciousness as a people, looking backwards instead of forwards, making a fetish of their Biblical traditions and their Talmudic writings, and turn them to a nervous, highly-strung, overwrought people. It is not difficult to appreciate why the younger members of this people, when the opportunity presented itself, threw in their lot with progressive or revolutionary movements, for therein, they saw, lay emancipation. Nor is it surprising that when freedom came to any section, as with those who escaped from Czarist tyranny to Germany, France, Britain or the U.S.A., they seized it with both hands.

But if anti-Semitism had reached its peak points during the Feudal and Middle Ages these peaks were still to be overtopped in the social crises that were yet to come to the capitalist democracies of the West. For the twenty-one years between the two world wars was a period of accentuating social struggle. In country after country

was heard the tramp of the hunger marchers. Unemployment rose to unprecedented heights. Germany, inhabited by a highly industrialised people, technically advanced, potentially capable of producing commodities in vast quantities, found herself, with her form of capitalist organisation, quite incapable of coping with her problems of production and consumption unless she had at her disposal ever-increasing access to colonies and empire. As the crisis deepened it became obvious that only by the total mobilisation of her people for total war could it be possible for a capitalist Germany to find a way out of the impasse in which she found herself. To this end it was essential that every progressive institution within the country should be destroyed, else how otherwise could her working class be relied upon to carry through, in machine-like fashion, the demands that would presently be made upon it?

Once more the existence of the Jews among the German population came as a Heaven-sent gift to the forces of reaction. For here were the very elements of social crisis that history had shown were so essential for successful anti-Semitism, and here were the self-same people, modernised it is true, but still in many respects the same.

The Nazis thus found a trump card to play. First it was only the Jews from Eastern Europe to whom they objected, not the more "cultured" German type whose grandfathers only were of Hebrew extraction. This move played on a class distinction, for the Jews of Poland were perhaps the most poverty-stricken in Europe. And the middle-class German Jew—and the middle-class German—fell for it. "Hitler hasn't bad ideas, you know, if only he stops just there." But the trouble spread. After all, a Jew is a Jew in spite of his clothes. The German working-class Jew went under, and working-class solidarity began to crack. But it is not merely because he is a Jew but because he is somebody's business rival that he is objectionable, and so, as the middle-class Jew fell, business circles found themselves split. Swept into power by violence and race hatred artificially inflamed, the Nazis finished off the working class itself. Their Trade Unions, Co-operative Societies and political parties perished. By the most drastic bloodletting Germany was seeking to cure herself so that she might organise her manpower as cogs in a vast machine to fight for a place in the capitalist sun. Such an army has no need of freedom but acquires its protection from the weapons it can produce. Brute strength alone shall count in future and by brute strength alone will the bonds that bind modern Germany be burst. Total war it must be. It is

a simple enough story, history repeating itself with just the necessary difference to make it suit a modern situation.

What then is the Jewish problem? Whose problem is it? Whatever be the answers to these questions, one thing is certain: that the problem in its manifold forms is not something in itself to be "solved" by some simple piece of political jugglery, but an aspect of something much deeper. True, it is a problem concerned with Jews, and if there were no Jews there would be no *Jewish* problem; but to say this is not to assert that there would be no corresponding problem of a similar nature. Hitler is reputed to have said that had there been no Jewish problem he would have had to invent one, so essential was it for his political purposes. The elimination of the Jews from the "Jewish Problem" would no more resolve the difficulties—social and economic—it expresses, than the shooting of every Jewish financier would eliminate the evils of finance. Only a Fascist confuses the individuals who express a problem in their actions with the problem they represent, and only a Fascist seeks a short solution to the problem by eliminating those who express it.

From the standpoint of the non-Jew, therefore, conscious of the way in which his mind has been warped and confused and his social aspirations thwarted by the age-old trick of anti-Semitism, the Jewish problem is simply stated: how to prevent the Jew, or indeed any other minority, be it Irish, Scots, Catholic, or Negro, from being used as a political pawn or a political scapegoat during periods of social crisis, and so sidetracking the activities of those who would seek a deeper solution to such crises. In effect this implies, on the part of the non-Jew, political and social pressure to achieve equality of citizenship and social standing to every minority group, Jew and non-Jew alike. It implies the elimination of racial bars and colour discrimination of every form, and the razing, once and for all, of the Ghetto walls that have been both a cause and a consequence of this discrimination throughout history. It seeks therefore to enlist the Jew as a full partner in the struggle for freedom and liberty for every citizen. This is the demand that every progressive non-Jew makes of every Jew.

From the standpoint of the Jew the problem presents itself in a rather different setting. Conscious of his history, alive to the fact that for good or ill he belongs to a people internationally distributed throughout the four corners of the globe, and anxious to retain and extend his cultural heritage, he is faced with the problem of reconciling his international setting and outlook with the retention of his specifically Jewish consciousness. As an aftermath

to the present orgy of Jewish slaughter there is no country that can claim to be the cradle of Jewry. The Jewish-Polish population has all but disappeared. The Jews in the Soviet Union constitute now by far the greatest single section of world Jewry. In such a socialist commonwealth their specific cultural development must necessarily be vastly different from anything that can occur anywhere else in the world. The contributions to Yiddish literature, novels, poems, music and drama, that are being made with the active encouragement of the Soviet authorities, in accordance with their general attitude of encouragement to Soviet nationalities, are contributions to Jewish culture. They have of course a specific Soviet flavour just as Jewish contributions to Spanish culture had a specifically Spanish flavour, but they nevertheless express Jewish life in the new society that is there being born. In the same way the contributions to Hebrew writings, music and poetry that are in creation in Palestine are also another aspect of the cultural development of this internationally distributed people.

Wherever the Jews are gathered together in sufficient density to establish a way of life of their own there will Jewish culture flourish, provided the conditions under which they live are such as to enable them to express that way of life in their own terms. This demands freedom of citizenship, equality of rights with other citizens, and full liberty of expression. If full freedom of this nature is inimical to Jewish continuity then that in itself is a criticism not of that freedom and liberty but of the strength of the Jewishness among its people. In the Soviet Union we can see the world Jewish problem in microcosm, for here indeed is an international society consisting in its elementary parts of distinct nationalities. Here, for example, are Georgians free to move about the Union either as Soviet citizens in general, playing their part as individuals within the general body of the State, or free to remain in their specific Georgian State living their own social and cultural life. So also with the Jews. Racial antagonism is a thing of the past because social crisis has passed once and for all with the coming of the socialist commonwealth. The crises of Capitalism or of Feudalism can no longer play their part in providing a setting for the use of a minority people as a political pawn. The deeper causes of crises have been eliminated.

Insofar as the Jewish problem consists in finding a milieu that will enable a people, vigorous in intellect, strong in emotion, and rich in historical tradition, to make its distinctive contribution at the growing point of history, here in microcosm is its solution. For

within this international society Jews are recognised as a people where they are sufficiently numerous to form a distinctive group.

The source of the Jewish tragedy lies therefore within the structure of the society of which we are a part, and it cannot be resolved by tinkering with that society. Ambulance work can of course be undertaken. Jews who are the victims of bloody massacres by Fascists and Nazis must if possible be rescued, just as other victims of mass murder must be rescued. Humanitarianism can make no distinction of race or creed. To move them if possible to a place of refuge is the desire of every decent person, and that desire must be translated into action. To suggest, however, that this provides an opportunity for a solution of the Jewish problem by translating them to Palestine, whatever its historical associations, is to chase a will-o'-the-wisp and to lose sight of the inner meaning of the Jewish problem. True, the Jews who have emigrated to Palestine have performed miracles in that they have made two blades of grass grow where none grew before. They have given to a sorely driven section of Jewry a temporary refuge and renewed strength. They have made great contributions to Jewish culture and there has grown up there a generation of people who are more conscious of the inner meaning of the Jewish problem than many others who have remained scattered throughout the rest of the capitalist world. But to suppose that in this way they have evaded the fundamental problems that beset any minority or small national group within an Imperialist world is to ignore the underlying realities. Palestine has associations for other peoples besides the Jews. It is manifestly impossible for Jewish development of a capitalist nature—and it cannot be otherwise, and it is not otherwise—to occur there, no matter how temporarily successful, without repercussions being felt by the Jewish and the non-Jewish inhabitants of that country and of neighbouring countries. The normal features of bourgeois capitalism are already well established, the class struggle only too obvious, while Zionist idealists look on with disillusioned eyes as the old scramble for profits among shopkeepers and industrialists makes its appearance in the Holy Land.

Moreover the movement towards Arab nationalism that is taking place in the countries bordering on Palestine is necessarily a force to be reckoned with. It is an indication of the tremendous changes that are occurring among a feudal people as a result of the forces that have been aroused by the war. Business enterprise and capitalist development will require a steady rise in the technical skill and capacity of the Arabs, who have lived so long under conditions

approximating to that of European Feudalism. Crisis, therefore, inescapable from capitalist development lurks in the background, and the tiny Jewish population of Palestine will have many complex problems of a political and economical nature to resolve before it can say that even within the framework of capitalism it will have the security that is present among the Jewish communities of the West. Like their brethren of the West the solution to their difficulties lies in a simple and straightforward acceptance of the same elementary principle that has to be accepted by Jews everywhere, viz., that no people can be free if in their midst or in their environment there exists a people which itself is not free. Should the Jews in Palestine succeed in acquiring for themselves some measure of Home Rule, then there is no reason to be found from a reading of history why, when crisis comes to them, they may not find themselves the victims of anti-Arabism, as an internal political pawn, just as Jews in the rest of the capitalist world have found anti-Semitism to be the watchword of the reactionaries during their periods of crisis. Moreover, a Jewish majority within Palestine or a section of Palestine is itself a Jewish minority within a wider Arab world. Only an incorrigible optimist would persist in regarding such a state of affairs, affecting as it must a mere fraction of world Jewry, as a solution to the Jewish problem. The Jewish problem lies deeper than any one section of Jewry. It underlies the whole social set-up of the West. If Jews and non-Jews alike desire to make a contribution to its solution, history and social analysis indicate quite clearly that this contribution can most effectively be made by both throwing all their efforts into the struggle to achieve equality and liberty for all peoples. Jews in the past have survived when they fulfilled a progressive function in society. To-day the world is undergoing a fundamental transformation. Only a blind man would deny that the next stable stage in world economy will be reached with the coming of international socialism. Within such an economy the Jewish problem must vanish like a forgotten nightmare because the causal factors that have given rise to that nightmare will have vanished. Not only common sense, therefore, but the very needs of survival demand that the Jew ally himself with the progressive forces in mankind. For he who stands aside imagining that, as an individual, he can evade his social responsibility, does the gravest hurt and injustice to his people. If freedom perish, the Jew will assuredly perish with it. It follows that those who, consciously or unconsciously, deflect the energies of a single Jew from the vital struggle against Nazism to-day, thereby risk the very existence of Jewry.

The Jewish State

By

CAMILLE HUYSMANS

I DO not claim to put forward any new idea for the solution of the Jewish problem. Positions have been well defined for some considerable time. As regards myself I had the good fortune to set forth my views for the first time at the International Socialist Congress held at Stuttgart in 1907. At that time I was secretary to the Executive of the Socialist International.

The Zionist Socialists had not yet made an appearance at our triennial meetings—and for a good reason. They had only just come into existence as a party, and had asked for affiliation.

Their request encountered considerable opposition, especially from the Jewish Workers' League (Bund) which had ramifications in Poland, Russia and the United States. The delegates of this organisation believed that *Poale Zion*¹ was not really an orthodox party. They accused it of being merely a body with nationalist tendencies which had done wrong in linking its socialist convictions to an ideology that was both bourgeois and artificial.

The delegates of several big nations were also hostile to this proposed affiliation, but the little nations thought quite differently, as did a number of the American delegates.

The affiliation of *Poale Zion* was granted on the same day as the Labour Party obtained its affiliation, despite the opposition of other British Socialist parties.

It was on this occasion before the commission for the confirmation of the mandates that I had a chance to support the idea of Palestine as a place of refuge and also, as a logical consequence, the idea of transforming this refuge into a state, equipped with all the attributes of such a political entity.

Several of my comrades only saw in my attitude an inclination to be paradoxical—a reproach which has been made against me often enough. As a matter of fact I was endeavouring to harmonise my socialist and international views with a very clear comprehension of problems of a national character. I had already arrived at the point of view put forward very forcibly later on by Jean Jaurès that the international world will be formed on the basis of national autonomies.

¹ Jewish Labour Movement.

Jaurès already foresaw that the only debatable point was the degree of autonomy which it would be necessary to yield in order to guarantee the stability of the international whole.

To-day—that is to say thirty-seven years later—I have not in any way altered these old opinions of mine, which have always seemed to me reasonable and acceptable. Nor is there any need to make a restatement of them to-day, for such statement has often been made. Such a declaration, covering all the aspect of the case, has appeared recently in an admirable and stirring book published in the United States.

The case has been quite recently dealt with in a brief manner by M. L. B. Namier and M. Philip M. Olivier in the *Manchester Guardian*. The points in question are, moreover, inherently referred to in declarations by Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Winston Churchill, and President Roosevelt.

I do not wish to pose as a prophet. At the same time, all the events of the past thirty-seven years have confirmed my belief in the necessity—to-day more urgent than ever—of first of all maintaining and strengthening the refuge known as Palestine, and then of seeking a chance finally to create the *Jewish State*, the organisation of which not only fulfils a necessity but meets existing obligations. Moral obligations or commitments, be it understood, but commitments so evident that no one would dare to deny their significance.

To-day, on the other hand, it is not so much negative ideas which are stirred up to combat the thesis as positive realities. Palestine has become too much of a success. The Arabs might be annoyed, and that is why immigration has been restricted, because the Jews have worked too well. They have given an example to those people who are ready to let things move on their own momentum because they do not want to do the work themselves. It would seem to be some people's opinion that inaction has rights which work cannot claim. It would appear that the capitalist idea of privilege still clings to existence.

We used to hear in those days: your illusions! You will never get the Jews back to the land. They have forgotten nature. They have become workers in the ready-made dress trade or in the luxury industries—London's needle-folk and Antwerp's gem-workers. They will not change.

Circumstances and experience have decreed otherwise. The Jews have gone back to cultivate the land. They have laboured a thankless earth, like the Flemings in the North of Belgium who have transformed their arid sand into a garden, the colours of which have

remained in their eyes—which explains the continuity of their school of painting.

The miracle of Palestine has thus had historical precedents. I would not go so far as to say that Palestine has imitated Flanders. The Jews had no need to study the history of Belgium in order to undertake their task. They simply worked in the same fashion after an interval of six or seven centuries.

When I read all these *a priori* declarations signed by illustrious names, I could not help noticing what a lot of foolish remarks men of intelligence often make when they begin issuing *a priori* statements.

The Zionist thesis has behind it necessity, authority, and logic, and I can only bring to it the backing of a Continental supporter who does not belong to the Jewish community, but has sought to understand it. I have observed the Jewish problem with the eyes of a Flemish citizen of Belgium, and this is perhaps why I have been able to grasp it so quickly. The Belgians too have had to fight for the creation and recognition of their state. It was a struggle which lasted several centuries, only to end in 1830. On the other hand, in the very heart of this state, the Flemings, who form at least half of the population, have been obliged to continue the fight for the legal recognition of their cultural rights, with the happy result that, in our state, made up of two linguistic groups, the co-existence of these two nationalities has not in any way interfered with the unity of the Belgian nation.

I have grasped the problem more easily than others in contact with the Jewish people because I have taken part in the political life of a city where, in 1940, there lived more than fifty thousand Jews. It has been my task to collaborate in the establishment of Jewish schools of all types, and to obtain for them the financial and administrative assistance of the public authority. This fact shows, incidentally, that anti-Semitism has never taken root in our country and is condemned to inactivity there.

When the war is ended the Jewish colony of Antwerp, scattered to the four quarters of the globe, will return to our country, and will be received with a wide sympathy commensurate with the infamous policy of persecution of which it has been a victim—a policy which definitely aimed at extermination.

I may say that I am not among those who think that all Jews will consider it useful and necessary for them to return to the historic fatherland of their ancestors—Palestine. Some will find a congenial home there, but others will choose the place where they wish to

live. Again, there are even a small number of émigrés who will seek to forget their origin. Absorption of the Jews will never be total. There will always remain in Palestine a Jewish people which will act as pivot for the Israelite community. As is the case for other nations, there will be Jewish colonies outside their own frontiers. In order that this evolution may take its normal course, the centre of the nation must be consolidated and have diplomatic representatives abroad. The day when the Jewish state comes into existence and possesses duly accredited representatives in other countries, anti-Semitism will lose part of its force, to the great benefit of humanity.

I do not propose to deal with the Arab problem here at the conclusion of my article. At the same time I do not wish to avoid answering a question which arises naturally enough. I am with those who think that the Arabs have nothing to complain of in the share of the world which has been allotted to them; nor will they lose anything by permitting other peoples to live.

On the other hand, the solution of the Arab question does not depend on the Arabs. It depends on the British and the Americans. It depends on the Jews, too, and the day when they decide to reduce the number of their internal differences and to group themselves round two or three fundamental ideas—the day when they will no longer offer the spectacle of sects fighting with one another with more bitterness than the reality of the circumstances warrants. They all desire the same thing, namely, the well-being of their people, whose tragedy has lasted long enough.

If they have gone through persecutions they have rallied round them former enemies. They have interested the Christian churches in their cause, and the latter have seen their duty all the more clearly because they have also suffered persecutions. There is nothing which brings men together in time of war more than common suffering.

One last word. It is my belief that the existence of a Jewish state in the body of the British Commonwealth will be a guarantee of peace for the Jewish people and for Europe, as well as being an element of safety in the neighbourhood of the Suez Canal.

Zionism and the Jewish Problem

By

DR. JOSEF HELLER

WE cannot understand the meaning of Zionism unless we comprehend its intrinsic connection with the Jewish problem in all its complexity. The current opinion that Zionism is a mere variety of modern nationalism as applied to the Jewish people is a half-truth, one-sided and misleading. For the Jews are not a nation in the usual sense of the word; in any case, they are not merely a nation. In other words, the Jewish nation is of a peculiar and unique kind. As Lord Balfour said, "the case of Jewry is absolutely exceptional, falls outside all the ordinary rules and maxims, cannot be contained in a formula or explained in a sentence." Any attempt to solve the Jewish problem must be founded on an analysis of the essential features which constitute the genuine unity of the Jewish people.

There exist within and without the Jewish community two radically different views upon the bond of unity which links together the Jews all over the world. According to the previously dominant and now less influential view, Jewish unity consists in a common religious faith: the Jews are a spiritual body, a religious community with common spiritual experiences, a common ritual and a common holy language and literature. According to the other view, the Jewish unity is that of nationhood in the ethnical and cultural sense of the word: like other nations the Jews are a historically developed collective entity, based on the belief in a common origin and in a common destiny, and characterised by distinct physical and mental peculiarities.

Neither of the conflicting views does justice to the uniqueness of our case. The Jews are not only a religious community: they have a national distinctness and individuality of their own, which run through the whole of their long history. Israel has never been a Church, it has always regarded itself as a holy *people*, chosen for a high spiritual and social task. But the Jews are not a nation like the other nations: the essence and existence, the mental formation and ultimate destiny, the past and the present, the historical reminiscences and the ideal of the Jewish people cannot be severed and divorced from its spiritual origins and from its religious attitude to life.

When Zionism was born—at the end of the nineteenth century—the older view which identifies Jewishness with a religious creed was dominating, unqualified and unopposed, within the emancipated Jewry of Western Europe. This abstract and unhistoric view was in discord with reality: it has been disproved by the fact of anti-Semitism which deprecates and hates the Jew not as an adherent of a certain religious creed, but as a distinct human group playing a definite part in the economic, social and political struggle of other nations. Nevertheless, this view became an article of faith for the advocates of assimilation, who were blind to the lessons of anti-Semitism and who strove to get rid of all the characteristics of their Jewish nationhood, fully to adapt themselves to their cultural and social environment and entirely to amalgamate with other peoples. Thus, the view that the Jews are nothing but a denominational variety of other national communities paved the way for the disintegration of the Jewish people and evoked the danger of its gradual dissolution.

The first task of Zionism was to reveal and combat the grave peril which lurked behind the slogan of assimilation. The other not less urgent task was to awake the Jewish people to the menace of anti-Semitism, to accept its challenge and to fight it on its own ground. Zionism proclaimed that the Jews all over the world are a real living nation—one nation (Herzl); that this homeless scattered and persecuted nation, leading its existence in abnormal, economically and spiritually unhealthy conditions, has neither abandoned its historical tradition nor lost its internal coherence and the will to live; and that the incompleteness and abnormality of Jewish life accounts to a high degree for the violence and intensity of anti-Semitism, while the more general root of anti-Semitism is a “herd-instinct” manifesting itself in modern Man as dislike of the alien and an antipathy of a majority against a minority group. The only remedy for anti-Semitism is the “normalisation” of Jewish life: the restoration of the Jewish people to its own soil in order to enable it fully and freely to unfold its physical and mental abilities in all fields of human productive activity.

To the Jewish masses the idea of Zionism was a mental revolution reversing their outlook upon life. Yet, on the other hand, it came to them as a restatement in new terms of their old belief in the future redemption of Israel. In spite of its modern dressing Zionism is nothing but the contemporary phase of an age-long yearning and striving, the rebirth of a hope which never was completely abandoned, and the re-formulation of a national and religious ideal to

which the Jewish people has adhered through two thousand years with constant and unyielding loyalty.

We must, then, not be misled by the verbal formulation of the Zionist creed; we must not take its outward appearance for its intrinsic content; we must not identify its political programme with its genuine meaning. Seen from the political angle, Zionism is no different from any other national movement. Yet beyond and behind the political formula lies a wider idea of the distinct nature, task and destination of the Jewish people—an idea which operates, partly consciously, partly unconsciously, within the Zionist movement, and immensely strengthens its grip on the masses. Herein lies the explanation of the conflict between Zionism and "Territorialism" as two varieties of the Jewish national thought. For the Territorialist there is no essential difference between the Jewish people and any other people apart from the fact that the Jews have no national homeland of their own: any territory suitable for mass immigration and colonisation could therefore, he believes, provide the basis for the solution of the Jewish problem. Whereas the Zionist recognises that the Jewish people has had to play a distinct, individual and unique part in history; that there is an indissoluble bond between the Jewish task in present and in future and the Jewish achievements in the past; and that only the reunion of the Jewish people with its historic homeland can restore the right function of the nation and raise it to its proper place in the international community.

Herzl, the founder of political Zionism, was a true believer in the ideals of liberalism and humanitarianism. His conception of nationalism was derived from the principles of equality, freedom and human brotherhood proclaimed by the French Revolution. Although his political thought had its origins in the rationalism of the Enlightenment, he clearly perceived the specific irrationality and singularity of the Jewish problem. He realised that this problem is not a concern of the Jewish people only, but of all mankind; that it is not merely a national problem, but an international question of human justice and morality. He recognised that "we must make the Jewish question a political world question to be discussed and controlled by the civilised nations of the world council," and that "whatever we attempt there to accomplish for our own welfare will react with beneficent force for the good of humanity" (*The Jewish State*). Although far from being a socialist, he saw from the angle of Jewish nationalism the necessity of far-reaching social reforms in the future Jewish state, and his ethical testament for the

Jewish people is: "Build up your home in a way that the stranger may feel happy in your midst" (Herzl's Diary).

None the less, it was not Herzl, the assimilated Western Jew, who brought into prominence the peculiar characteristics of the Jewish problem which differentiate it from any other national problem. It was the Eastern trend in Zionist thought which emphasised the spiritual, ethical and religious component of Jewish nationalism. In the Eastern European Zionists, the heirs of the "Lovers of Zion" and children of the Jewish Enlightenment movement (Haskalah) whose most celebrated teacher was the Hebrew writer and thinker Ahad Haam (1856-1927), the Jewish messianic hope and the belief in the specific Jewish mission in the world were still a living spiritual force inseparable from their love to the Jewish people. It was in the East that the conception of "spiritual Zionism" was born: a conception which stresses the ethical and philosophical meaning of Jewish life. Jewish nationalism is, from this point of view, more than a political movement; it is more than a "nationalism" in the narrow, ethnical meaning of the word. It is a striving towards the fulfilment of a high human ideal, which has been the motive power in Jewish history. The decisive feature of the Jewish problem is therefore neither anti-Semitism nor the economic and political abnormality of the Diaspora existence (the "sorry plight of the Jews"), but the degeneration and disintegration of Jewish spiritual life, because of its separation from the native soil and because of the irresistible disruptive influence of alien cultural surroundings (the "sorry plight of Judaism").

The Jewish national-spiritual idea found a most definite expression in religious Zionism represented by the "Misrachi" movement and by prominent orthodox and liberal Rabbis in Europe and the United States. From this point of view the messianic idea of historic Judaism—essentially akin to Christianity yet differing from the Christian idea in some decisive points—appears to be the deepest motive of the Jewish national movement. The Jewish problem is therefore not only a national-ethnical, but, first and foremost, a spiritual-religious problem with a national and an international aspect, and the aim of Zionism is not merely the establishment of a Jewish Commonwealth in the Land of Israel, but to pave the way for a rebirth of the spirit of the Prophets and for the revival of Judaism.

The age-old Jewish messianic ideal does not coincide with the political ideal of Zionism, but reveals its ultimate meaning and puts it in its proper place in the context of human history. In this

wider perspective we see clearly the connection between the Zionist movement and the religious and social crisis of to-day, and we realise how the realisation of the final aims of Zionism is related to the universal ideals of social and international justice. We understand why "synthetic Zionism" (a term apparently coined by the present Zionist leader, Dr. Chaim Weizmann) could gather under its banner champions of the nationalist as well as of the socialist idea and representatives of divergent trends of religious thought, all united by a common task. The Zionist movement has indeed as unique and complex a character as the Jewish existence itself: it is the resultant synthesis of all the intellectual and emotional factors which have determined the path of the Jewish people through the Gentile world.

Now the ground is prepared for a better appreciation of the programme and aims of Zionism. The Zionist idea is incompatible with national power policy, which runs counter to the general trend of our history. As Herzl pointed out, the solution of the Jewish problem must be based on international justice and become itself a beneficial factor in international life. The realisation of the Zionist aim must neither aggravate existing national conflicts nor lead to oppression of any national minority or to new entanglements in the play of world-power policies. The Jewish Commonwealth, reborn on its own soil, is to be politically independent and culturally self-reliant. But it shall and will not encroach on the self-expression and self-government of any other nation. The existence and independence of the Jewish Commonwealth must be guaranteed by international agreement.

Geography and history have predestined for Palestine a part of primary importance in the political and cultural relations of the civilised nations. Situated at the junction of three continents, Palestine became the birthland of world religions, the meeting place of races and civilisations, and a holy land for the Jewish, Christian and Islamic communities. It is the only country organically connected with Jewish history as well as with the history of the Western world: it is, like the Jewish people, a link between the ancient and the modern culture. It must keep up its unequalled function in the spiritual life of humanity. In the frame of an international arrangement safeguarding the peaceful development of the country in co-operation with all other countries Palestine can and must become an asylum for the nation from whom it has derived its glory. The aim of Zionism is a just international solution both for the Jewish question and for the problem of Palestine—a solution which will

open the way for the Jewish people and for its ancient homeland to discharge their proper task in the history of mankind.

After the tragic catastrophe of the second world war a new international situation will arise calling for greater solidarity and closer co-operation between nations and commonwealths of nations. The area of the Near and Middle East—with its vast uncultivated territories, with its vital oil sources and rich resources of other raw materials, with its sparse semi-nomadic and semi-agricultural population only slightly affected by the industrial civilisation of the West—will inevitably become one of the most important fields for international collaboration and competition. The task of reviving the Middle East, of bridging the cultural gap between Europe and the eastern shore of the Mediterranean, which was the cradle of human civilisation, and of mediating between the Christian and the Islamic circles of nations, can be achieved neither by the European states nor by the reawakening peoples of the Arab world alone. The Jewish people, which in the Middle Ages acted as an intermediary between the Arab and the Christian civilisations, seems to be predestined for this great task.

Zionism has already begun with the work of reconciling and reuniting the East with the West. Not aggression and conquest, but creative work of peaceful reconstruction, colonisation and education, of fertilising a country which has been derelict and deserted for many centuries, of resettling and rebuilding it without ejecting or displacing or harming anyone, is the means by which the Jewish people hopes to attain its national aim. Not by expropriating and dispossessing the present inhabitants of the country, but by co-operation with them and by trying to raise them to a higher level economically and culturally, Zionism tries to make Palestine a prosperous home for two races. It is the first attempt in world history to restore without violence a lost country to a people which was expelled from it by violence about nineteen centuries ago.

While promoting the welfare of the Palestinian primitive population the Jewish colonisation also prompted the awakening of the Arab national self-consciousness, provoked the jealousy of the Arabs and roused their desire to stop the Jewish immigration in order to retain the rejuvenated land in their own hands as an exclusive property. The reaction of the leaders of Arab nationalism against the Zionist movement is quite natural and psychologically intelligible. Neither is it astonishing that the Arab states which emerged after the last war and whose rapid development has been greatly favoured by the policy of Great Britain, do not view with a friendly

eye the prospect of a Jewish state arising in their midst. Yet what matters is not the present mental attitude of Arab nationalism as such, nor the political ambitions of the young Arab states, but the question whether the Arab demands are more justified than the Jewish claim on Palestine. The Arab-Jewish difference must be settled not in accordance with the temporary and transient political situation or with the selfish interest of some of the affected states, but in accordance with international justice and with the abiding wider interests of humanity.

To find the right way out of the dilemma, we must consider the different aspects of the conflict with regard to the following issues :

(1) The meaning and qualifications of the majority rule and of national self-determination in case of a conflict between national communities.

(2) The personal rights of individuals belonging to different communities in one country.

(3) The political rights of the national and religious communities living together in one country.

(4) The historic right of the Jewish people to Palestine.

(5) Whether the Arabs or the Jewish people have a superior right to Palestine as a national homeland.

Some people may think that the will of the major part of a population living in a certain area must be recognised as the only decisive factor in all questions regarding this area. These people would maintain that the claim of the Jewish people to Palestine is invalidated by the mere fact that the majority of the present population of Palestine seems to oppose the aims of Zionism. Yet this view is obviously erroneous. The will of a "majority" and the self-determination of any human community have no absolute and unrestricted authority: their competence is limited by the universal principles of morality and justice, by the natural rights of the individual (the rights of Man) and the rights of other national and religious groups, as well as by the higher interests of the international community. As Norman Angell remarked, the argument that the will of the "majority" is the only essential characteristic of a democracy is "a shallow misreading of the democratic principle"; to argue that the wish of a national majority in a small corner of the earth must be decisive even in matters of general international importance "is no more democratic than it would be democratic for a village, situated on some great artery running through a defile in the mountains, to decide that it has the right to block the communications

of a whole nation because the village elders have decided by a majority that they did not like traffic to pass this way." Now, the fate of Palestine concerns not only the "majority" and the "minority" of the population which happens to live in the country at the present time: it is a vital matter for the whole of the Jewish people needing a homeland of its own and it is an issue implying far-reaching international consequences. "The homelessness of the Jews, the existence of millions of wandering, persecuted and desperate people, is a fact that concerns the whole of mankind, the whole of civilisation, and cries aloud for a solution . . . Are the Arabs a majority in this connection?" (Norman Angell.)

On the other hand, it is clear that the Jewish claim to Palestine can in no way affect the right of the people inhabiting the country to preserve the material and cultural conditions of their existence, to live a free human life in accordance with their inclinations and religious belief, to work on the soil they possess and to apply their natural endowments to all kinds of human activity. Nor can the Jewish national aim impair the freedom of the national or religious communities living in Palestine to maintain and develop their own spiritual and cultural peculiarities and to lead their internal affairs in accordance with their own will. No "higher" reasons can justify the violation of rights of the individual or the oppression of any ethnical or cultural minority.

The Jewish right to Palestine is based on the abiding historic and actual connection between the Jewish *nation as a whole* and the land where it was born and matured. It is of course true that the mere fact that a human group lived for some time in a definite area does not give this group a permanent right to the possession of this area. Geographical and political conditions which existed in the past are not in themselves a sufficient basis for a national claim in the different conditions of the present: there is no reason why old frontiers should be restored simply because they existed centuries ago. Nor does the *bare possession* of a territory constitute in itself a real moral and legal reason excluding other groups from this territory. The real source of right either for an individual or for a social or ethnical group is *creative activity*. And the right of a nation to its homeland derives not from the external fact of habitation or from a factual situation belonging to the past, but from *productive work affecting the character and the value of the country* and from *significant cultural achievements* closely related with the life of this country which have set their indelible stamp on the mind of the nation and became *permanent factors* of national life. A nation has

therefore an "historic right" to the land which was the stage of its childhood and youth, because the connection of the nation with the land has become a creative factor and a constant element of cultural development both in the history of the country and in that of the nation itself. Therefore the claim of the Jewish people to the Land of Israel is irrefragable: as Israel has impressed the perennial mark of its genius on the history of Palestine so has the memory of the country become an essential ingredient of the nation's spiritual life. Moreover, Zionism itself by its constructive economic and cultural activity in Palestine has revived and corroborated the Jewish historic right: its development has been a decisive feature in Jewish history creating a new ground for an old claim.

But has not, one would ask, the Arab people an equally valid historic and national right to Palestine? Does not the claim of the Palestinian Arab population of to-day outweigh that of the Jews?

The answer to this question is clear. While we must fully acknowledge the right of the individuals and of national and religious communities to live their own lives in accordance with their will, the claim of the Arabs to Palestine *as their national homeland* is questionable. We have indeed seen that two conditions are necessary in order to justify the claim of an ethnical group to a certain country as its national homeland: the existence of a distinct nation with a historically developed national character and a national culture of its own, and the existence of an intrinsic relation between the national culture and the history of the country. Now, in the Arab case, both these conditions do not seem to be fulfilled. Whether we consider the question of Palestine from the point of view of the great Arab nation as a whole, or whether we confine ourselves to the small section of the Arab nation which lives in Palestine—in both cases the Arab claim does not seem to be well founded. The Arab nation, in the wider meaning of the word, comprising the many millions which inhabit the wide area between Arabia and Egypt in the south, Syria and Iraq in the north, a nation with a glorious past, a great religious tradition and a culture of its own, cannot of course seriously pretend to be connected with Palestine as its historic homeland. It is, on the other hand, very doubtful whether the one million of Mussulman and Christian Arabs who now live in Palestine constitute a distinct separate nation with a historical heritage of their own: they themselves at any rate claim to belong historically and culturally to the wider Arab community and aspire to be politically united with the existing Arab national states. Furthermore, it is hardly possible to point out any economic or cultural achievements

of the Palestinian Arabs which would manifest the interrelation between their history and the history of the country: as a matter of fact, the desolate country remained almost a wilderness during many centuries until the beginning of the Jewish resettlement at the end of the nineteenth century.

From whatever angle we view the question, it is apparent that the claims of the Arabs cannot invalidate the Jewish right to restore their national home in Palestine, provided that the civil and national rights of other sections of the population are safeguarded. The future of the Jewish national home can be secured only by the creation of an independent Jewish commonwealth, which has to play a substantial and leading part in the economic and political life of the country. So long as the Palestinian Jews are a minority, their position in the "homeland" is not essentially different from the position of the Jews in the diaspora countries: they depend on the goodwill of a numerically superior non-Jewish population, harbouring ambitious political designs and tending to unite with the surrounding states into a great Arab federation. On the other hand, there is no reason to fear that a Jewish majority in Palestine would "swamp" the Arabs and be able to oppress them economically and politically. Apart from legal and international safeguards, the general character of the Jewish national movement as well as the minority position of the Jews in the diaspora and the vital importance of good relations between the Jewish commonwealth in Palestine and the mightier Arab states around it exclude the possibility of any attempt on the part of the Jews to adopt an aggressive national policy. It is indeed unbelievable that after the bitter experience which the Jewish people has undergone in its sorrowful history, a small Jewish community would venture to violate the rights of another national community living within its borders, while millions of Jews have to live under the rule of other peoples and while it is certain that the Arab neighbour states would vigorously interfere in favour of their brethren and retaliate upon their Jewish minorities.

Assuming that the hope of the Jewish people will come true and that it will succeed in establishing its home in the land of its ancestors, will this mean the final solution of the Jewish problem?

To answer this question we must distinguish two aspects of the Jewish problem: the national-economic and the national-spiritual aspect.

So long as there exist substantial sections of the Jewish nation in the diaspora these sections have no solid economic foundation and are dependent on the economic system of an alien national com-

munity. Because of the psychological tendency to dislike an ethnically alien group, particularly when it appears to be a rival and competitor, the Jewish minority will always be more or less disliked by many members of the majority people. Anti-Semitism will not disappear until the problem of national minorities is fully solved, *i.e. until a better social order and a higher ethical standard of international, social and economic collaboration is attained*. In the meantime, we cannot expect with certainty that *the whole* Jewish people will soon be able to return to Palestine, and that there will be no Jewish diaspora. Therefore although the intolerable disability of Jewish existence—the homelessness of the nation—will be removed, the Jewish question, as regards diaspora Jewry, will not be effaced. Zionism is the most effective means to lessen the sting of anti-Semitism and to mitigate the difficulty of the Jewish problem, but it will hardly wipe out all the sufferings and evils that afflict the Jewish people. It must be supplemented by solid political and international guarantees securing the human rights and the economic and political equality of the Jews wherever they live. One of the paramount duties of the responsible statesmen of the Allied nations will be to find, after the war, better ways to protect the economic and social position of ethnical and religious minorities—and among them the Jewish minorities—in the future “better world.”

The fate of the decimated European Jewry is also closely bound up with the general solution of the refugee problem. It can be foreseen that a considerable part of the escaped, exiled and deported masses will not be able or willing to return to the places where their old homes, now mostly destroyed, stood, and where their dearest friends and relatives were barbarously maltreated, starved and slaughtered. For many people, especially for Jews, a restoration of their pre-war economic position in their native country will appear impossible, as some of the changes in the social and economic structure of the European states, now under the Nazi yoke, are irreversible. These unhappy people will have to find new homes either in Palestine or in other non-European countries. The regulation of the migration movements, the adequate distribution of the refugees between different states, their absorption, re-education and adaptation to new conditions—these are tremendous tasks to be dealt with by the leaders of the Allied nations.

Insofar as Palestine may not be able immediately to absorb all the millions of uprooted human beings who long for a new home, we shall also have to look for other territories suitable for Jewish colonisation. There can be no doubt, however, that no other country

has the immense stimulating and attractive power which makes the land of Israel the "unique territory" of the Jewish nation: no other land can satisfy the yearnings of the Jews and provide the basis for a real solution of their national problem.

The highest value of Zionism lies, however, not in the material and political sphere, but in its spiritual meaning for the Jews and for the world. It is this moral and spiritual effect of the development of a free Jewish community in the land of the Prophets which paves the way for the final settlement of the Jewish question. The mere existence of the restored Jewish home will beneficially influence the psychological, political and social situation of those Jews who remain outside the national home: their self-esteem and Jewish consciousness will be strengthened, their belief in what the Jewish people strives and stands for will be fortified, their religious feeling will be vivified, their human dignity will be heightened. Their position within the non-Jewish national communities and their place in the life of the state will become clearer and more definite: their attachment to Zion as an embodiment of the Jewish national and spiritual ideal cannot interfere with or impair their faithful allegiance to the state in which they live as free and loyal citizens, proud both of their Jewish culture and of that of their native country and eager to contribute to its welfare and to co-operate for the common good with the national community with which they are bound by a bond of natural love, devotion and gratitude.

Zionists hope and believe that the land of Israel will again become a source of spiritual life for the Jews and for the non-Jewish world alike. They believe, as the Jewish scholar and religious thinker Claude Montefiore wrote, that "in order to give some distinctive spiritual gifts of value to the world—in order to enrich civilisation by a fresh variety of spiritual culture—the Jews, or at least many Jews, must live in a country of their own. There must be at least a spiritual *centre*. The homeland will provide such a centre, from which will radiate influences both to the Jews outside and, gradually, to the world at large . . . From the centre alone can the outer communities be spiritually fed. For in the homeland—in Palestine—there will, they believe, before very long, begin a great spiritual revival. And then from Palestine, as the issue of this revival, noble spiritual products of utmost value—ethical and religious in the broadest sense of those two words—will be given to the world for its enrichment and purification. Then, truly, through Jewish agencies and Jewish life Torah will come forth from Zion and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem."

Zionism and the Jewish Settlement

By

BLANCHE E. C. DUGDALE

TWENTY-FIVE years ago the end of Part I of the World War brought international recognition of the moral right of the Jews to reintegrate themselves as a nation upon the soil of Palestine. That is the claim of Zionism, and its acknowledgment was embodied in the Balfour Declaration of 1917, later incorporated textually in the Mandate for Palestine, allotted to Britain by the League of Nations. The motive forces which led to this result originated entirely on the Jewish side. Their beginnings must be traced to the very roots of Jewish history: they are interwoven with the Messianic hope which the scattered people cherished through two thousand years of the Dispersion, and their development into modern political form took place in the last decade of the nineteenth century, when the passive mystic expectation of a return to Palestine quickened, within the Zionist Movement, into an active determination to achieve the goal by work and not by waiting. Many influences combined to bring this revival of Jewish national consciousness to birth. Its cradle was Eastern Europe, containing at that time some seven million Jews, or over two-thirds of the Jewish population of the world. In those regions Jewish tradition was strongest, Jewish life more segregated, but the Jewish lot far harder, and anti-Semitic persecution more endemic than anywhere else in the Christian world. There, if anywhere, thoughtful men of Jewish race could realise the tragedy of a homeless despised minority, could perceive the effect of such an abnormal position upon the minds and bodies of their people, and resolve to claim for themselves, and for their children yet unborn, their historic right to a homeland, and to yearn for the free national life and development which is denied to no other nation upon earth. Undoubtedly the craving for normality is one of the strongest urges behind Zionism, but as the very name of the movement proves, it finds expression not only in the desire for *a* home, but for *the* home, in the land promised once to Abraham and to his seed for ever. This is the spiritual force which has enabled the Jews to make their colonising effort in Palestine a success, and to base it upon agriculture—an extraordinary achievement for a highly urbanised people, divorced for centuries (through no fault of their own) from

the traditions and contacts of the soil in the countries of their wanderings. The reunion of the Jewish people with the land in Palestine has, in the past twenty-five years, worked such a transformation upon both, that the casual visitor to the country may easily underestimate the miracle which has been wrought, or imagine that it can be easily repeated elsewhere. But modern experience of some other attempts at Jewish agricultural settlement in various parts of the world proves that this is far from being the case, although in every instance the physical conditions were less unfavourable than those with which the Jewish pioneers had to struggle when they started to wring a living from the land, among the stones and malarial swamps of Palestine as they found it. The first of these non-Palestinian experiments was promoted by the millionaire philanthropist Baron Hirsch, after the Russian pogroms of 1881. He founded the Jewish Colonisation Association, with a capital of £8,000,000, with part of which a million and a half acres of highly suitable land was acquired in the Argentine. The statistics of 1935 showed some 15,000 Jews farming this huge tract, more than fifty years later. The colony has not perished, it has indeed received a few hundred refugee families from Nazi Germany—but it has never proved enough of a magnet to check the townward drift of its children, who thus only add to the "Jewish problem" in the Argentine.

More recently, efforts have been made to settle Russian Jews on Russian land. Colonies were founded in the Crimea and the Ukraine in the 1920's, another in Birobidjan in 1928. The South Russian experiments have come to very little; no inward impulse manifested itself among the masses who respond so eagerly to the Zionist idea, and the hostility of the land-hungry local peasants to Jewish settlement has been an obstacle from outside. This may not operate so strongly in the less populated regions of Siberia, but from such information as is forthcoming about Jewish settlement in Birobidjan it does not appear to be making remarkable progress. Out of the forty thousand families of Russian Jews estimated in 1940 to be engaged in agriculture within the borders of Soviet Russia, some 2,000 families were settled in Birobidjan, a very small proportion of the Jewish population within the borders of Soviet Russia at that date, and a mere fraction of those who have been absorbed into industrial occupation since the Revolution abolished the private trader and the independent artisan. But whatever the present or the future of Russian-born Jews in Russia may be, they do not form part of the Jewish problem as it will have to be faced, so soon as Europe ceases to be a battle area, and the nations turn to the reconstruction of their

homes and their lives. The prelude to that must be the dealing with wreckage of every kind, including human lives, and among these will be practically the whole remnant of the European Jews who once lived between the Baltic and the Black Sea, the Atlantic sea-board and the Russian border.

At the present moment no precise estimate can be made of their numbers. There are no statistics of the mass murders already perpetrated by the Germans, nor, until the occupied countries are finally purged of German presence and influence, can there be any guarantee that the butchery of Jews is at an end. Moreover, until the western frontiers of Soviet Russia are fixed once more, no one can say how many of the Jews in the regions of the Russian advance of 1939-40 will find themselves within the boundaries of the U.S.S.R.

But it is reckoned that the number of Jews who will constitute an immediate problem is not likely to be less than two million people. There is a natural tendency in England (and doubtless in other countries where some of the Jews have managed to flee) to consider the whole matter as a question of the future of refugees; that is to say, as it most directly affects ourselves. What the Government and the nation have done, or failed to do, for Jewish refugees in past years; what it is our duty and right to do, or to refuse to do, for them in the future, and how far our national duty, or interest, extends as regards responsibility for what happens to them next; these are the type of questions on which we are apt to concentrate. Important indeed they are, but even after national policy on these matters is laid down, the future of European Jewry will still remain an international problem. Refugees will not constitute anything like the half of the two million. Hungary, for example, while screwing up her anti-Semitic laws, has stopped short of massacre or expulsion of the 800,000 Jews who live within her present borders. Other Axis satellite countries have yielded in varying degrees to Nazi demands upon them to murder their Jews, or to send them to slave labour. The future of refugees is only part of the problem, although it cannot be solved separately from the whole. Theoretically it would be possible for countries in which Jews have found asylum to shove them back across their frontiers, or to ship them out to sea; practically it will not be done. The question of what is to happen to them has therefore to be brought down to earth in a literal sense, and examined in terms of the economic and political possibilities of the various States being able and willing to contribute towards providing a future for the Jews. But the desires of the Jews themselves must not be left out of account. Refugees may or may not wish to try to pick up the broken

thread of their lives in their original surroundings. In many cases this may be as doubtful as that countries in which anti-Semitism is chronic will be willing to increase their Jewish population after the war. To return unwanted people to places where they do not want to go would be as unhelpful as the sudden or forcible uprooting of groups who have somehow weathered the storm on the spot would be cruel and wrong. In whatever way the United Nations approach this matter it must not be with a milder imitation of the Nazi spirit, but as interpreters of the Atlantic Charter and its guarantees of human and national rights. The handling of the Jewish question will be the supreme test of whether these principles are really to be the foundation of peace. The Nazis blooded their young gangsters on the murder and torture of German and Austrian Jews. The training which reached its pitch of efficiency in the human abattoirs of Poland will go on being practised on every Jew within reach, until the Nazi power is utterly broken. The Jews have no Government of their own to fortify their resistance, to keep tally of the crimes committed against them, to put forward their claims to compensation for property of which they have been robbed.

These facts lay a special moral responsibility upon the United Nations, which could not be discharged by any efforts to settle the future of European Jewry except in consultation with the Jews themselves. Organised Jewish life is represented in two forms. The one (of which the Board of Deputies of British Jews is an example) deals with every communal Jewish interest in each particular country, and also with the rights of Jews in lands where their status or position may not be satisfactory, and with certain general interests of Jewry. The other is the Jewish Agency for Palestine, constituted under Article 4 of the Mandate for Palestine, a democratic, internationally elected organisation, concentrating entirely upon work in and for Palestine, its chief centres being in Jerusalem and London. Its claim to speak for the vast majority of world Jewry is unquestionable. Its President is Dr. Chaim Weizmann, and its essential structure has not been affected by the war.

The local organisations, however, have in many European countries been broken up, but out of the floating wreckage of Jewish lives some vestiges of them can probably be re-assembled. On the European Continent, Allied Governments, in preparing for relief and reconstruction in their countries, will no doubt make special arrangements in regard to their Jewish populations, making contact with the Jewish representative organisations, especially here and in the U.S.A. In Britain the Board of Deputies is the appropriate body,

and the American Jewish Conference, held last September, represented the overwhelming mass of Jewish opinion in the United States. Thus, even before the end of the war, study might be begun of the economic and political prospects for re-settlement of Jews in the countries of their birth. There they should have the status of citizens, sharing the rights and duties of all citizens, with equal claim upon any system of international protection of minorities guaranteed under the Peace Settlement. Should the Jewish National Home in Palestine develop into a Jewish State, the political status of Jews who are not citizens of that State should remain unaltered. These are the general lines along which the future of Jews remaining in Europe may be laid down with justice and fairness to all.

But even so, only a fraction of the problem would be disposed of. Whether it is examined from the political, the economic, or the psychological angle, there is general agreement that some place, or places, of new settlement must be sought for the Jews. The division of opinion lies between those who believe that it has been found in Palestine, and those who still search the map for some territories less open to difficulties and objections. The land of their dreams would be some fertile tract in the temperate zone, awaiting development, empty, or at any rate inhabited by people who would view with favour the influx of a large Jewish immigration. But no such region has so far been discovered and it does not appear that more favourable conditions will offer themselves anywhere in the world to-day than in the colonising experiments in the Argentine and Russia, where the measure of success has proved so small. Land colonisation, under the best imaginable conditions, is an expensive, laborious process. Work and money have to be poured into it, much of which must always be counted *à fond perdu*.

Between 1919 and 1938 £16,500,000 came into Palestine through voluntary Jewish national collections, and £90,000,000 through private investments. Moreover, the Jewish immigrants who laid the foundations of their National Home in the soil of Palestine twenty-five years ago were rich in assets not translatable into terms of money. Their vanguard consisted of men and women in the prime of their youth, glorying in physical endurance, high-hearted, full of idealism. Their old people followed later, their children are Palestinian-born. The Jews whose future is the problem to-day are of all ages, impoverished, torn from their environment; broken by terror, hunger, and torture of body and mind. Even from the purely economic point of view, the nations who undertake the re-settlement of such people should first satisfy themselves that conditions do not

foredoom the enterprise to become a mere waste of money and energy of which no country will have a surplus for many years to come. Regarded from the political and social point of view the breakdown of a large-scale effort at transfer of the remnants of European Jewry would result in a tragic aggravation of the existing situation. Anti-Semitism would spread and intensify, and the burden of Jewry would fall back heavier than ever upon the Jews themselves and the Gentile world. For these reasons the "territorial" solution outside Palestine is fraught with danger, and its advocates should pause and analyse the attraction it has for them.

The answer, honestly given, would in most cases be that it is *not* Palestine. The unwillingness to encourage the growth of Jewish national life in that country is not as a rule caused by hostility to the Jewish claim to nationhood as such. Some semi-assimilated Jews may indeed still hope to stifle the national movement which is bound up with the idea of the Return. But their number is diminishing, and they exercise little influence now on Gentile opinion, though their views may be quoted and exploited by non-Jews who, for other reasons, are opposed to a Jewish Palestine. Broadly speaking, Gentiles everywhere think of the Jews as a people separate from themselves, not merely as a religious sect, and if Palestine were an empty country only virulent anti-Semites of the Nazi brand would oppose their desire for national independence in their old home. But Palestine is not empty, and in the British mind the Arab question is the chief difficulty in the way of accepting the Zionist solution of the Jewish future.

Arab hostility to the presence of the Jews in Palestine is indeed a political fact which no realist can brush aside, no optimist has any right to hope to conjure away, and no respecter of national claims may underrate. For its root is the same urge and instinct for independence and free self-development which is felt by every nation, and is the motive force behind Zionism itself. The racial conflict in Palestine is the result of the awakening national consciousness of the two great branches of the Semitic people, and in that wide setting it must be seen, and treated. This war has produced two new factors which make a fresh line of approach imperative, and at the same time more hopeful. One is the dire need of the Jews for a home of their own. The other is the liberation of Arab lands in North Africa from Italian control—the completion of the process begun in the last war when we freed them from the Turks, and which has been carried out from first to last with little assistance from the Arabs themselves. Nothing now stands between the Arabs—to quote the

88

words of the British Foreign Secretary—and such measure of unity and independence as they can themselves achieve. Nothing—so the Arab nationalist may reply—except the presence of the Jews in Palestine. It is because of the promises made to them by non-Arab Powers that Palestine has remained a Mandated territory, deprived of the independent status which has been given to Irak and had already been promised to Syria and the Lebanon before the present war. This was the point of view put by the Arab leaders, with the Mufti of Jerusalem at their head, before the Royal Commission early in 1937. The Report of that Commission, which, it is generally agreed, is the result of most penetrating and unbiased enquiry on the spot, states that Arab hostility to the Jewish National Home will not be modified by efforts to crystallise or restrict its growth. “Big or small,” they say, “it blocks the way to national independence. Big or small, the Arabs insist on their right to govern it as part of a self-governed Palestine.” There is no reason to hope that the attitude of the extreme Arab nationalists has changed since 1937. Now, as then, when the Arab rebellion was at its height, the Palestine countryside abounds in examples of Jew and Arab living in amity side by side. Now, as then, there are doubtless Arab leaders who would take a less intransigent attitude if they thought it expedient. But it is best, when dealing with difficulties like this, to grapple with them at their most stubborn point, and Arab nationalism has not been so mellowed in recent years as to offer much hope that moderate elements will attain control. With the others, the argument of economic advantage from Jewish work in Palestine falls like water off a duck’s back. “On the balance,” says the Report, “the National Home has meant a substantial gain to them . . . But even if they could be persuaded to admit it, we are quite convinced it would not appreciably weaken their antagonism.”

The logical consequence of this became clear to the Commission. With the Arabs, the demand for national independence took priority over stoppage of Jewish immigration and land purchase. “Given independence,” as the Mufti of Jerusalem said, “the Arabs will deal with the Jews themselves.” These were among the reasons which led the Royal Commission to report that Palestine was suffering from a disease so deep-rooted that, in their view, the only hope of a cure lay in a surgical operation. They therefore recommended the termination of the Mandate and the partitioning of Palestine into two sovereign independent States, Arab and Jewish. The Holy Places were to be included in an enclave, for which a new Mandate under the League of Nations should be framed.

The British Government accepted the Commission's Report. The Zionist Congress empowered the Jewish Agency for Palestine to enter into negotiations. Not that they were in love with the idea of a divided Palestine—very much the reverse: but this was the late summer of 1937, and world Jewry has only too much reason to be a sensitive barometer of world events. Its leaders felt the pressure of the gathering tempest. They foresaw the coming need for some haven of refuge for Jews, where Jews themselves should be the keepers of the gates. Among all the heart-burning and divisions of opinion which proposals as drastic as those of the Royal Commission were bound to produce, there was one other consideration which made for unity. If war came, every Jew in that representative Congress, assembled in Zurich from all quarters of the globe, knew on whose side the Jewish nation would be found, and on whose side it would desire to fight. How far this thought stands expressed in the Congress records I cannot say, but I know (for I was there) that the majority of the delegates shrank at that juncture from rejecting out of hand the principles of any plan which might give the Jews even a foothold on this wide earth which they could call their own and organise, not only as a refuge, but as a base for their war effort and their military training. How right this instinct was has been proved in a way no one could have imagined in 1937. But who can doubt that, if a Jewish State had existed even in part of Palestine, before the Nazis marched to Vienna and Prague, hundreds of thousands of Jews would be alive who to-day are dead? And the twenty-odd thousand Palestinian Jews now scattered through the British forces would not have been refused their urgent request for a name, a flag, and Divisions of their own. But the Arabs were not prepared for any concessions, and the Chamberlain Government threw over the Report of the Royal Commission, and struck out on a different line of policy in the White Paper of 1939. This was designed to restrict Jewish land purchase, and to bring Jewish immigration to a full stop in March 1944, at a point calculated to leave the Jews a permanent minority in Palestine. The Mandate was to be brought to a close, and the country proceed towards self-government. This programme at the moment of writing still holds the field. Should it be carried out, the world would be able to judge for itself what the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem meant when he said to the Royal Commission that "given independence, the Arabs will deal with the Jews themselves."

Such a finale to twenty-five years of British Mandatory Government in the Holy Land is not to be contemplated. But the sands are

running out. The White Paper indicates the date when "No Jew need apply" is due to be written over the gates of Palestine, and already the intervening months can be counted on the fingers of one hand. Since August 1939 the Jews of Palestine, supported by all their communities outside, have subordinated everything to furthering the Allied war effort, in the farms, the factories, and (so far as they have been allowed) in the fields of battle. But they have made no secret of their determination to resist the further implementing of the White Paper by every means in their power when the war ends. That document contains nothing but the seeds of unrest, bloodshed, and destruction of all that has been built up in Palestine in the last quarter of a century. A wretched contribution indeed on the part of Britain to the solution of the Jewish problem, and to the peace and stability of the Middle East! But it is against these vast backgrounds that the future of Palestine must now be examined. On the Jewish side the picture is world-wide. On the Arab side, it takes in all their liberated territories in Asia and Africa, containing almost infinite room for increase of population and development of every kind. One notch in these huge areas has never been a purely Arab land (for Jewish communities survived in the cities of Palestine even after the Moslem invasion of 700 years ago). Certainly it can never be purely Arab now. Quite apart from the existence of the Holy Places, a quarter of a century of Jewish work has precluded that. Facts have to be dealt with as they are. In Palestine (which is about the size of Wales) the national aspirations of two great and ancient peoples clash, and cannot at present be harmonised. But the Arabs of Palestine can look elsewhere, which the Jews cannot. Those Arabs who do not want to share the prosperity and the standards of living of an independent Jewish State can take up land in the fertile, underpopulated regions beyond Jordan, and every economic assistance should be provided for that voluntary transfer. This should be the post-war way to perform the "surgical operation" pronounced necessary by the Royal Commission. Partition is not the road to final solutions, and the conditions which made it seem worth reluctant consideration on the eve of war do not apply to the dawn of peace. Palestine is a very small country, but within its present area, comprising hills, plains, coasts and harbours, it will be possible for it to absorb quickly at least the two million people whose future has here been considered. More than half a million Palestinian Jews await their coming with open arms—a state of affairs existing in no other spot on earth, and a moral factor of great importance.

One more word. A Jewish State, situated on one of the great

Blanche E. C. Dugdale

strategic key-points of the world's sea and air routes, would be as a rock for defence of all those freedoms which we fight to establish. If in time a Jewish Palestine were to become part of the British Commonwealth of Nations all the world would be gainers, and most of all the Jews and ourselves. Anglo-Jewish partnership was the idea in the Balfour Declaration of 1917. A return to it would be constructive statesmanship in 1944.

Anti-Semitism and its Cure

By

ELIZABETH A. ALLEN

IN primitive communities local events are held to be due to the direct intervention of good or evil spirits beyond the control of man. The witch doctor quickly learns to turn such abysmal ignorance to his own advantage.

With an increase in knowledge, however, belief in the supernatural gradually ceases, though there remain some calamities, such as war and unemployment, which through lack of knowledge are still considered to be beyond control.

When these so-called uncontrollable events make life too unbearable for the people their natural reaction is to blame those whom they believe to be responsible. The latter, in self-preservation and in order to camouflage their own shortcomings, must find a scapegoat on which the people's anger can be vented.

Frequently, though not always, the Jews have been seized on to fulfil this role, but other groups have also been used for the same purpose. For instance, in the Middle Ages and down to fairly recent times the gypsies were persecuted. They were held to be responsible for various natural phenomena such as droughts, floods, storms and famines, not to mention sterility in cows or the death of domestic animals through plague. Their arrival in any locality was considered a calamity and they were subject to physical attack and in many places were held to be outside the law. In small homogeneous communities with no minorities those with a squint, red hair, a hare-lip, or any other peculiarity which made them stand out from the rest of the community, were liable to be accused of having an "evil eye," of being a "witch" or "in league with the devil" and in consequence responsible for any evil that might befall the community. In modern times the Negro has been made the scapegoat for various social troubles in the U.S.A.

Consider for a moment the traditional expression, "Butchered to make a Roman holiday." How many people through the centuries have been "butchered to make a Roman holiday" and distract attention from the social troubles of the time? In Czarist Russia the value of such a "holiday" was fully understood and the Jews

were made the scapegoats for the high taxes, bad administration, etc. Whenever the regime felt itself to be in danger and public feeling was rising, pogroms against the Jews were organised and the anger of the people was diverted from the real source of their troubles and turned against the Jews.

Have the Jews been used as scapegoats and suffered persecution in Britain? There have been Jews continuously in Great Britain since the seventeenth century. During that period they have suffered no worse legal or other disabilities than have other dissenting sects like the Quakers, the Baptists, or, for that matter, the Roman Catholics. Readers will remember the vicious persecutions from which all such sects and groups suffered during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In the nineteenth century, however, with the spread of the idea of the "Rights of Man" almost all the disabilities on the members of these sects were removed. In the nineteenth century, too, humanitarian ideas were spreading through all sections of the population and refugees from persecution in other countries were welcomed to these shores, so that even insofar as the Jews might be considered by some people to be a different problem as representatives of a separate race rather than of a separate religion, they were welcomed just the same.

Furthermore at the beginning of this century there came an influx of Polish Jews, fleeing from Czarist pogroms and persecutions. They settled in some of the larger towns and segregated themselves in certain sections of these towns. They tended to work in the same industries, they were slow at learning English, they kept themselves to themselves. If there had been any inherent reason why the Jews and non-Jews should not be able to live together amicably it would have shown itself then. Even more would the strains and stresses of the last war have brought this problem to the fore had it existed; and although feeling ran high in certain parts against people with German names, amongst whom of course were Jews, and their shops and business premises were attacked and damaged, yet there was never any suggestion that any of these attacks were directed against Jews as such. Nothing was heard of anti-Semitism till Mosley with his British Union of Fascists introduced it into his programme in 1933 and persecution of the Jews began. Mosley himself boasted that there was no anti-Semitism in this country until he imported it.

Anti-Semitism has also been growing in other parts of the world during the last ten years and in all these countries the local Fascists

take credit for its growth.¹ The Nazis in Germany took the lead in attacking the Jews and as the local Fascists gained power and strength in the other European countries the attack on the Jews by these local Fascists increased.

What are these Fascists trying to attain? The Fascists represent the reaction against the growing demand amongst the people of all countries for a larger share in the government of their country and greater control over the conditions under which they live. This demand was becoming ever more insistent between the two wars. The general aim of Fascists is to resist this demand and, in fact, to abolish democracy and set up a dictatorship in the interests of the few. They must therefore suppress the democratic organisations, the Trade Unions, Co-operatives, every kind of working-class organisation and such other organisations, cultural, professional or religious, as will prevent the Fascists from exercising their will freely over the populace. For the same reason freedom of speech, freedom of the Press, freedom of association and freedom of assembly must be abolished because, so long as these exist, the possibilities of opposition to the dictatorship exist also.

The easiest way to weaken the democratic organisations is to divide them from each other and to sow distrust between the individual members of these organisations. Not only are Jew and Gentile incited by the Fascists to distrust each other, but in Great Britain also Irish and English, Scots and English and, in the U.S.A., Coloured and White. In factories in Great Britain it will usually be found that the anti-Semitic worker is also anti-Irish, and in the U.S.A. it is not a coincidence that race riots between Coloured and White flare up in Detroit, the home of American Fascism and anti-Semitism.

Because the Jews have been singled out in many countries for blame in the past there remains a residue of anti-Jewish feeling. Similarly because unthinking people hand down from generation to generation the old saying "Taffy was a Welshman, Taffy was a thief," many innocent Welsh people suffer from unjustified suspicions. It is from these irrational racial prejudices that racial hatred can be fanned into flame. In Europe the Jews are the most easily recognisable group and it is for this reason that they are chosen by

¹ In Rumania, long before its occupation by the Nazis, the Fascist "Iron Guard" was attacking and killing Jewish citizens and the Jews were gradually deprived of many of their legal rights; in Holland, Mussert, leader of the local Nazis, viciously defamed the Jews and by 1938 four of his followers had been elected as deputies to the Second Chamber. In Poland, ghetto benches in the schools and universities were introduced in the thirties and Jews were attacked in the streets. Similar examples can be found in most other countries.

the Fascists as their instrument to weaken democracy. Not only are Jews a recognisable group but they are to be found in all classes; in consequence they can be used as bogeys to both rich and poor. To the working and professional classes the Fascist suggests that the Jews control the finance, the Press, the insurance of the country; that through the control of the chain store, of the medical profession, of the legal profession he is ruining the livelihood of the non-Jewish small shopkeepers, doctors or lawyers. In fact, all Jews are rich, powerful and a millstone round the neck of the working community. To the rich the Jews are painted as bolsheviks, anarchists, Trade Union agitators and everything the rich business man most dislikes. "If the Jews are rich, they are birds of prey. If they are poor they are vermin," said Lloyd George in 1923.

When this propaganda begins to make some impression on the public the next stage begins. The Fascists ask whether such people as the Jews should remain members of social clubs, members of professional bodies, officials of societies, etc. Should they be allowed to marry into other sections of the community, should they be allowed to study where and what they like and take up any trade or profession? Once such questions become a burning issue the fate of democracy hangs in the balance.

In any community the existence of second-class citizens with second-class rights constitutes a constant threat to the rights of first-class citizens. If it is permissible to discriminate against the Jews, why not against all foreigners? Why not against those with unpopular views? And so the Fascists extend their policy of discrimination against groups and points of view they dislike until there is discrimination against all except those who belong to the Fascist party. This happened in Germany and has happened in all countries where Fascism has taken power.

The simple presentation of these queries, and the discussion which inevitably follows, helps to undermine the solidarity of the organisations which Fascists wish to destroy. Every time that a Jew is excluded from an organisation merely on account of his race, every time there is discrimination in the appointment of officials, the power of the organisation to do its work is weakened and its possibility of service to the community lessened. It is weakened by not being able to use its best people and by being distracted from whatever may be its primary task to the discussion of the qualifications of members which are not based on merit.

As soon as there is sufficient doubt as to whether the Jews should or should not have the same rights as other people the Fascist is

able to take the next step of attacking other sections of the populace by labelling them Jews. In France the Freemasons were a strong body sympathetic to democracy, so the Fascist said "All Jews are Masons, therefore all Masons are Jews." If the first part of the statement was not a fact still less was the second, but it served to link the Masons with the, by then, unpopular Jews. In Germany the Nazis said "All Jews are Communists, therefore all Communists are Jews." This statement was no more true than the statement of the French Fascists about the Masons, but it allowed the Nazis to put their political opponents in concentration camps on the ground that they were probably Communists and therefore Jews.

"Democracy is a Jewish conception." This statement in various forms is used to undermine faith in democracy by suggesting that Jews are somehow responsible for democracy and therefore democracy is a bad thing. "Stop the Jews' War," "Jews' War," slogans with which some of the streets of London have been plastered, show the attempt of Fascist-minded people in Britain to make the present war for democracy appear as a war for the Jews and therefore undesirable to the British people.

How is it that this anti-Semitic propaganda of the Fascists is able to achieve success? It is always illogical and usually highly improbable. There are several reasons why it can succeed. The most important is that in times of economic depression when there is heavy unemployment; in time of war when there is a certain war weariness in the air; after a war when members of the forces are looking for work and trying to adjust themselves to peacetime conditions, the ordinary person lives under a great strain: he is ignorant of the causes which create the conditions in which he finds himself and unthinkingly accepts any explanation offered. These are the problems which the ordinary man has not yet learned to control effectively, and to which we referred at the beginning of this section.

The anti-Semites, like the primitive witch doctors, take advantage of this situation for their own ends. With all the knowledge of modern advertising technique, rumours are launched each adjusted to the class in which it will circulate. Doctors are told that Jewish doctors are starting up practices in areas from which doctors have been withdrawn for the forces, small shopkeepers are told that Jews are opening up shops in places where existing shops have been blitzed, or where most of the small proprietors have been called up for the forces; the fact that these rumours cannot be substantiated and that there are laws, regulations and customs which prevent these

things from happening, does not prevent the unthinking from passing these rumours on. The general public is told that the Jews are making the black market. The fact that in Germany and German-controlled countries where no Jews are allowed to trade there is a flourishing black market, is not mentioned. If it were it would show that it is war conditions which make the black market, not the Jews.

Anti-Semitic advertisements and letters are inserted in newspapers. There are not many of these but enough to keep the public Jew-conscious. This knowledge of modern means of influencing public opinion, and the use of different forms of publicity according to changing circumstances, is often overlooked by those who believe that all erroneous ideas including anti-Semitism can be removed by discussion and debate. Frank discussion between two parties both genuinely searching for truth can result in nothing but good and possibly in truth being discovered. Discussion, however, between two parties, one of whom is spending considerable sums and much ingenuity in using the same technique as the big advertiser which is "tell the public often enough about it and they will believe it," and the other of whom perhaps writes an occasional letter to the papers, perhaps helps to organise an occasional meeting but who feels at the back of his mind that it is all rather embarrassing, that publicity may do the Jews more harm than good—this is like the fight between the Abyssinians armed with spears and righteousness, and the Italians armed with poison gas and Fascist propaganda.

Finally, behind Fascist anti-Semitic propaganda lies the threat of force. It is not only in Germany and the Fascist countries that Jews and everyone that for any reason could be thought to have Jewish connections, and many more who could not, have been beaten up. In the East End of London there was a real reign of terror before the outbreak of the war, with physical assault on both Jew and Gentile. Citizens—non-Jews as well as Jews—who perceived the threat to democracy and publicly resisted the growth of Fascism received anonymous threatening letters from time to time. Events proved that these were not idle threats.

What can be done to prevent the growth of anti-Semitism? Unfortunately there is no law in this country to make racial or religious discrimination an offence, and there seems no way through recourse to the law of preventing the diffusion of anti-Semitic propaganda. It should not, for instance, be possible to publish the Protocols of Zion, of which the sole purpose is to excite ill-will between different sections of the population and which has been

proved to be a forgery and discredited in almost every country in the world. Legislation to this effect exists in the U.S.S.R. and the introduction of such legislation has been under consideration in Sweden, in New York State and in Massachusetts.

The National Council for Civil Liberties has made some study of the state of the law on this question, and I am indebted to the Council for permission to quote the following extracts from their report on Legislation and Anti-Semitism. The N.C.C.L. makes the following suggestions for legislation :

1. No person shall do any act whether by word, deed or writing which directly tends to provoke unfavourable discrimination against any racial group of His Majesty's subjects or against members as such of any such group.
2. No person shall in public do any act whether by word, deed or writing which tends to insult any racial group of His Majesty's subjects or any members as such of any such group.
3. No person shall commit any act whether by word, deed or writing which is likely to expose any racial group of His Majesty's subjects or any members as such of any such group to hatred, ridicule or contempt.

The argument most often brought against legislation is that it would put the Jews in a privileged position. This of course is incorrect. Such legislation would be available for the defence of any minority group of the community. It should also be clear that it is not a question of defending individuals from fair and reasonable criticism which may be rightly directed against them on account of personal actions. It is not, however, in the interests of the community as a whole that any section should be the subject of attack. Legislation is only one method of combating anti-Semitism, and it is clear that without a considerable education of public opinion it would be impossible to obtain the passage of such legislation and even if it were obtained it would fail unless it had public support.

How can the public be made to understand the dangers of anti-Semitism? Anti-Semitism must be challenged at all stages. For instance, from time to time anti-Semitic advertisements appear in newspapers. These should be dealt with at once both by letters to the Advertising Manager and answers to the advertiser himself. Anti-Semitic letters in newspapers should be answered and the attention of the Editor should be drawn to articles with an anti-Semitic twist. Booksellers sometimes stock books and pamphlets without realising that they contain anti-Semitic propaganda, and are very shocked when they realise it.

If there is an outbreak of slogan-writing on walls and pavements the attention of the local police and Watch Committee should be drawn to the desirability of catching the perpetrators. More could be done by local authorities under existing regulations and bye-laws.

Rumours and stories should always be countered.

Anti-Semitic propaganda is constantly taking new forms and the Fascist-minded adapt themselves to changing conditions with great ingenuity. At one time they are interested in preventing the acceptance of the Beveridge Report, so the Jewish friendly societies are accused of sabotaging it. They hope as a result that those who are anxious for the adoption of the Beveridge Report will consider their enemies to be the Jews and not the interests who are opposing it. At the time of the mass evacuation of children from the towns there was an outbreak of scabies amongst some child evacuees who came from one of the poorest areas. The Fascist-minded anti-Semites started the rumour that the scabies was due to the hoarded money brought by the Jews to the neighbourhood. With this rumour they hoped to blame the Jews for the conditions of the child evacuees.

After the war the Jews will no doubt be blamed for any failures in demobilisation plans and for all the inevitable difficulties which will result from the change-over from war to peace conditions. Those who are determined to fight anti-Semitism must be prepared for these developments.

Droughts, floods and pestilence are no longer thought to be the work of evil spirits because knowledge has increased and their causes are understood and steps are taken to limit the damage or perhaps even prevent their occurrence. As the causes of war, of poverty, of unemployment, become more fully understood they too will be prevented. Suggestions that Jews, just because they are Jews, or, for that matter, the members of any other minority, because of almost supernatural powers, are responsible for these things, will become pointless and an anachronism.

This wider understanding, this spreading of knowledge can only come through the development of democracy. This will entail a prolonged and hard struggle in which all citizens, Jews and Gentiles, will be involved. The Jew cannot stand aside claiming that the fight is one for the Gentile only.

Together Jew and non-Jew can build a democracy in which anti-Semitism can have no place and in which racial discrimination is remembered only as an ugly nightmare of the past.

The Fight Against Anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia¹

By

DR. A. STEINBERG

IN the history of anti-Semitism Russia occupies a prominent place. One of the few Russian words adopted by all modern languages in its native form is, significantly enough, the term Pogrom, as describing anti-Jewish rioting. Accordingly, to the outside world Imperial Russia became the classic land of the most outrageous form of anti-Semitism. Government and people were both held equally responsible for those last remnants of European barbarity, and Russian Jewry was pitied as the helpless victim of misfortune.

The Revolution of 1917 revealed in its true perspective the outline of the main factors in the position of Russia's Jews, as it had impressed itself upon the foreign mind. With the disappearance of the gulf between People and Government, disappeared also the old antagonism between the Government and the Jews. And as to the relations between Gentile and Jew, what could have proved more convincingly the belief of Russia's intelligentsia that the anti-Jewish feeling in the country had always been the effect of government ill-will than that the Russian people gave general approval to Jewish emancipation? Enacted by the Kerensky administration in April 1917, the emancipation reached its climax after the October Revolution. Together with other victims of the oppressive policy of former Russian governments, Jewish revolutionaries became leading members of the Sovnarkom (Council of People's Commissars), the ruling body of the newly created Socialist Republic of all the Russias. The reversal of the old relations between Jewry and Government was complete.

One was tempted to believe, and many did believe, that the death-knell of Russian anti-Semitism had at last sounded. Such an over-optimistic view, however, had no foundation in fact. Once again, as so often in the Jewish past, the climax only foreshadowed an anti-climax. Instead of dying out, anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia acquired the character of an illegal movement directed simultaneously against the new form of government and the old enemy,

¹ Paper read to the Research Committee of the British Section of the World Jewish Congress, February 1944.

Israel. Consequently, the Soviet Government, in its fight for survival, had no other choice than to strike simultaneously against anti-Sovietism and anti-Semitism. The longer the struggle lasted the more embittered it grew, the more anti-Semitism and anti-Sovietism became interwoven, until they were almost indistinguishable. Their far-reaching inter-connection inside Russia accounted, incidentally, for the erroneous assumption, widely spread abroad, that the coincidence of anti-Bolshevik and anti-Jewish tendencies implied a real identity of Jewish and Communist aspirations.¹

In point of fact, the Soviet Government, notwithstanding the presence of members of Jewish extraction in its midst, never had any particular reason to favour the Jewish cause, as such. From the outset, it was unflinchingly devoted to that kind of Internationalism which precluded any form of loyalty to the interests of any particular group not bound together by "class solidarity." If the policy of the Soviet Government, insofar as the Jews were concerned, was not restricted to a mere negation of anti-Semitism; if the measures taken in the Soviet Union with regard to its Jewish population were partly inspired by a broader and more positive attitude towards the Jewish question, it was nothing more than the application of general principles of Internationalism to a special case.

Free from anti-Jewish or pro-Jewish leanings, the Soviet Government tried again and again, with a persistency unparalleled in history, to get rid once and for all of that harmful plant commonly known under its pseudo-scientific name "anti-Semitism." And yet the weed grew. Even to-day, in her military campaign against Russia, Germany is playing the anti-Semitic card as one of her main trumps. It is therefore of the greatest importance, particularly from the Jewish point of view, to study comprehensively the many stages through which the fight against anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia has been carried; to find out, if possible, where the ineffectiveness and setbacks of that deliberate struggle may have had their main cause; and, finally, to ascertain whether the unique experience of that struggle does not suggest conclusions of a general character which may be of practical value in an analogous situation in other countries and in times to come.

That the Soviet Government was already confronted with the anti-Semitic menace during the process of its formation in October 1917 is shown by Trotsky in his autobiography.² When Lenin

¹ See, e.g., Hilaire Belloc, *The Jews*, 3rd ed., London, 1937.

² L. Trotsky, *My Life*, ed. 1930, p. 292.

invited him to take over the Ministry of the Interior, Trotsky refused on the ground that, being a Jew, he would not be able to subdue counter-revolutionary uprisings without causing avoidable embarrassment to the Government. Reluctantly, Lenin agreed.¹ In spite of their extreme Internationalism, both Lenin and Trotsky realised that by a total disregard of anti-Jewish prejudices, they would have been running the risk of putting the whole Revolution in jeopardy.

Similar considerations had determined the more moderate predecessors of the Bolsheviks in the governments of the Russian Revolution (the Liberals, the Radicals and the Socialists) to keep Jews out of office altogether, a policy agreed upon in close consultation with the moderates among the Jewish leaders themselves. As long as the war was on, it was thought, nothing should be left to chance. The establishment of the Soviet Government itself had its special difficulties. Its leaders were firmly resolved to make peace at any price, or, more precisely, to transform the "Imperialistic War" into an international class war. Therefore, the Soviet Government was bound to deal with the Jewish question, too, in a more resolute way—at least, with the negative, anti-Semitic aspect of that question. The hesitations of the first days were overcome when the equality of all citizens of the Soviet State was made absolute.

The views of the chiefs of the Russian Communist Party on anti-Semitism were very definite and of long standing. According to Lenin, "the only political group which persistently conducted the fight against anti-Semitism is the Party of the working class."² Already in 1913, Stalin expressed his conviction that "anti-Semitism served only the interests of the exploiting class, being the lightning-conductor of the capitalist system devised to divert the striking power of the toiling masses."³ At the outset of the Revolution, when not yet a star of the first magnitude, Stalin was already instrumental in promoting the policy concerning Russia's nationalities. In Great Britain, he was recognised in his true capacity as early as 1921.⁴ Later, almost all historians of the Russian Revolution came to the same conclusion that the extension of the idea of "fraternity," inherited from the French Revolution, to the relations between national groups was mainly the work of Stalin.⁵ This fact throws a peculiar light on our special subject. Whatever changes, since

¹ Cf. A. Steinberg, *Archiv. für Sozialwissenschaft*, vol. lxiv, p. 639-40.

² *The Jewish Question* (in Russian), Moscow, 1924. See also *Encyclopædia Sovietica*, vol. III, Moscow, 1930, s.v. Anti-Semitism.

³ J. Stalin, *The Marxian Doctrine and the National Question*, 1913.

⁴ *Report of Lord Emmott's Committee*, published as a White Paper, Cmd. 1240.

⁵ S. & B. Webb, *Soviet Constitution*, London, 1935, pp. 141-3, 145, 463-4.

1917, the fight against anti-Semitism in Soviet Russia may have undergone, they cannot be reduced to a mere change of the persons active on the political stage, but must be traced back to the varying conditions of political life in its entirety.

In the initial stage of the Revolution and during the civil war of 1917-21, pronounced anti-Jewish leanings, let alone activities, were regarded as the surest indication of ingrained hostility towards the Soviet regime, and were dealt with accordingly. Scarcely one among the more or less prominent representatives of Russian anti-Semitism, of whom the Soviet authorities could get hold, was spared. The facts that in 1918, the President of the Tcheka, the Jew Uritsky, was assassinated by another Jew, the youthful poet, Kohngisser, that Lenin had been shot at by a Jewish girl, Dora Kaplan, that a great many Jews belonged to the fiercest opponents of Bolshevism, and were in the same plight as the Jew-baiters themselves—compelled some of the latter to take stock of their anti-Semitic theories, to revise, to correct and even to reject them. But the secret tribunal called Tcheka gave no quarter even to repentant anti-Semites. Just as in the eyes of an anti-Semite, Communism was a "Jewish crime," the Russian Communists looked upon every sort of anti-Semitism as a crime against the working class. The more capital the anti-Soviet movement, inside and outside Russia, tried to make out of the conspicuous participation of Jews in the Soviet administration, the less attention the Bolshevik leaders paid to the anti-Jewish prejudice. Trotsky, who earlier, out of consideration for this prejudice, refused to be appointed to the Commissariat of Internal Affairs, became the Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet armed forces, and both the Moscow and St. Petersburg Soviets had Jews as their Presidents (Rosenfeld-Kamenev, Trotsky's brother-in-law, and Radomyslsky-Zinoviev). "Kill the Jews, save Russia," became the battle-cry of the anti-Reds. Wherever they were victorious they celebrated their victory by bloody pogroms; whenever the Reds got the upper hand over the Whites, the first victims of their fury were the perpetrators of the crimes against the Jews. No doubt, the war of extermination waged against Russian anti-Semitism was partly directed by Jews. They did it, however, not as Jews, but for the sake of an Internationalism which freed them from any obligation towards their own people. On the other hand, in very many cases the Jewish members of the revolutionary committees and tribunals were the only ones who pleaded in favour of arraigned Jew-baiters, mostly without success.¹

¹ Prof. James Mavor, *The Russian Revolution*, London, 1928, p. 379.

Outlawed from the very first days of the Revolution, Russian anti-Semitism has finally been stamped as a criminal offence by the Constitution of the U.S.S.R., now in force. Its Article 123 declares in a general form that "the advocacy of racial or national hatred and contempt is punishable by law." The wording of this Article, taken in conjunction with previous decrees designed to combat the anti-Jewish disease, leaves no doubt whatsoever as to the specific "hatred and contempt" which the Fundamental Law of the Soviet Union intends to eradicate.

Decimated, terrorised, robbed of their leaders who had been either executed or driven out of the country, the anti-Jewish elements in Soviet Russia seemed, at the end of the civil war, to be in a hopeless position. Yet Russian anti-Semitism survived. As soon as the Government, safe in the saddle, loosened the bridle and adopted in the field of economics the so-called "New Economic Policy" (NEP) which conceded to small trade and industry a measure of elbow-room, sparks of anti-Jewish feeling sprang again into life all over the country. The highly developed faculty of the Jews, above all in Eastern Europe, to adapt themselves to the most unfavourable conditions gave them the best chances in circumstances of free competition allowed by the Government within very narrow limits. "Nepman," i.e., the successful business man under the NEP conditions, was regarded as equivalent to "Jew," and the first name being in the mouth of every orthodox Communist a word of abuse, the second, in its turn, obtained an unpleasant meaning. It did not matter much that many of the most respected "comrades" were Jews; the world always used to judge the Jews rather by the "misdeeds" of some of them than by their normal activities.

The unexpectedly quick recovery of the beaten foe made it clear to the Government that repressive measures against anti-Semitism were not adequate. At last it took notice of the repeated warnings which had been stressed by men like Maxim Gorki, to the effect that the governmental fight against anti-Semitism must fail, if not supplemented by a campaign of education and re-education on a big scale; in particular, by dissemination among all the peoples of Soviet Russia of adequate knowledge concerning the past and present of the Jewish people; only such a campaign would evoke among the Gentiles active sympathy with the martyrdom of the Jews and full understanding of their peculiarities. Since 1922, a flood of pro-Jewish literature had been pouring into the bookshops, public libraries and reading-rooms of Russia's towns and villages. In many

parts of the country, particularly in the Ukraine and White Russia, the Jewish question was discussed and explained at mass meetings.

The results, if any, were negligible. After the death of Lenin, in 1924, the Soviet Union had to face a kind of interregnum. The splitting up of the host of his lieutenants into two camps, with Trotsky in command of the weaker of the two; the amazing fact that the majority of the best-known Jewish Communists deserted the stronger man (Stalin) and joined the Opposition; and, lastly, the main asset of these Jewish Communists, their better connections with the outside world, provoked a feeling among the members of the Russian Communist Party that their Jewish comrades belonged to a separate, even to a foreign body, to an International of its own, very distinct from the "Comintern." Whether this fallacy had been spread about deliberately, from above, is a matter of conjecture. It is, on the other hand, not too hazardous to assume that the loyalty of some Jewish Bolsheviks may still have been, if only unconsciously, divided between pure Communism and a nationally tinged preference for certain leaders. Be that as it may, the fight against anti-Semitism, because of this Party cleavage, suffered a striking setback. All observers of Russian life during that period agreed that hatred of Jews was again on the increase.¹ In spite of the fact that the use of the name "jidd," the Russian version of the English "sheeny," was punishable, as an "incitement to national spite or contempt," the ominous word sounded again all over the country, even in the workers' clubs adorned with the portraits of Marx and Lassalle, of Sverdlov and Kaganovich (all of Jewish origin).

The matter could not be left there. After the difficulties inside the Party had been overcome the Soviet Government made a further attempt to get at the root of this evil. Stalin proclaimed: "Anti-Semitism in the U.S.S.R. is to be implacably persecuted, as something essentially inimical to the Soviet Idea."² The Government was about to embark on a scheme of general reconstruction, on the first of the famous "Five-Year Plans" (1928-32). It was only natural that in the struggle against anti-Semitism, as in all fields of Soviet activity, stress should have been laid not merely on terroristic suppression and vociferous propaganda, but, first and foremost, on reploughing the very soil which apparently had not ceased to nourish the loathsome weed. The abnormality of the economic position of the Russian Jews and their dispersion was recognised

¹ Maurice Hindus, *Humanity Uprooted*, London, 1931, pp. 207-8, 211, 251, and Theodor Seibert, *Red Russia*, 1932, pp. 65, 70-4.

² See *Political Vocabulary* (in Russian), Moscow, 1940, p. 31.

as the main source of all their troubles. Many attempts had already been made to "normalise" the position of Soviet Jewry. From now onwards measures of greater importance and wider scope were taken in hand. Outstanding among these constructive measures was the creation of the "Jewish Autonomous Region" in the Far East—Birobidan—and the establishment for the Jews of a national status legally equal to that of the rest of the Union's nationalities (Article 22 of the Constitution of 1936).

The ascendancy of anti-Semitism in Central Europe, since 1933, did not fail to react unfavourably even on Soviet Russia—where racial and national hatred has always been anathema. The anti-Semitic disease did not affect Soviet Jewry directly. Despite the heavy outside pressure brought to bear on Bolshevism by the renewed propaganda of the old lie that Communist and Jew are identical, the Soviet Government refused to pander to anti-Jewish racialism and classed it as a particularly crude variety of international Fascism. The fact that during the "purges" which took place before the second world war, an extraordinarily high percentage of the persons accused, condemned, and executed were men of Jewish origin, is easily explained by the peculiar distribution of the contending forces already mentioned. The guiding principle of those "purges": "When there falleth out any war, they also may join themselves unto our enemies" (Exodus, I, 9), Pharaonic as it was, had still nothing to do with anti-Semitism. Even the *rapprochement* with Germany, after the Munich conference of 1938, made no difference in that respect. The ensuing reshuffle of the personnel in the Soviet diplomatic service, which had always been over-abundantly filled by Jews, was misconstrued in some quarters as the first sign of a policy of racial discrimination. Inside the Soviet Union, however, there were no traces of such a policy. The "Political Vocabulary," issued in 1940 for the guidance of all State and Party officials, makes it clear beyond any doubt.¹

Still the general attitude of the civilised world towards the anti-Jewish racialism in Germany and Italy had made a deep impression upon the rulers of Soviet Russia. They became aware of the fact, however strange it might have appeared to their way of thinking, that for the time being "class solidarity" was not the decisive factor in world politics; that the "bourgeoisie" was prepared to sacrifice, if need be, the flesh of its flesh, its Jewish part, for what was presumed to be the national interest; and that the Jews all over the "capitalist world" were in a position of isolated, defenceless and

¹ Pp. 333, 370, 474, 598, 632, 648, 649.

disconnected minorities. Under such conditions it was thought that with regard to Jews the policy of the Soviet Union, surrounded by a ring of hostility, must be to keep silent.

When, in 1940, the Soviet Government annexed the territories on the fringes of the Western border of the Union, from the Baltic to the Black Sea, which were infected with the anti-Semitic virus, its newly-established authorities made it a special point to emphasise their neutrality in the Jewish question. Only since June 22nd, 1941, the day on which the whole edifice of Soviet neutrality crashed to the ground, the air of detachment in relation to the Jewish question, temporarily assumed by the Soviet Government, was abandoned. In countering the meanest sort of anti-Jewish abuse which is being ceaselessly poured out from the German wireless stations, inciting the population of the Soviet Union to "save Russia by killing the Jews," the Soviet speakers do not mince their words. In a way rather unusual in Western Europe, they are making fun of the "so-called Aryans" and do not hesitate to comment accordingly on the "smell of their blood." The Soviet fight against anti-Semitism has become one of the aspects of the bloodiest war in the entire history of human conflict.

The part which Soviet Jewry itself took in this prolonged and ever-changing struggle is as yet difficult to assess in full. The Soviet regime barred it from acting as an organised body. The older generation "mistrusted the Greeks, even when they offered gifts," as the saying has it. As individuals, particularly those of the Soviet vintage, a great many Russian Jews took their own preventive measures. They spared no efforts in getting rid of their inherited Jewishness. Dispersal over the immense surface of the Soviet territory, infiltration into the most favoured trades and professions and inter-marriage were the main directions of the spontaneous Jewish reaction to new conditions. It is clear that their common denominator has been assimilation.

Summarising the ups and downs of the battle which has been fought in Soviet Russia for more than a quarter of a century, and taking into consideration the failure of Germany to achieve success by using anti-Semitism as a means for disrupting Soviet unity, we are entitled to say that the efforts of the Soviet Government have not been in vain. But even Russia's new generation does not seem to be entirely immune from anti-Semitic infection. The weapon is blunted, but not destroyed. The necessity of self-protection, on the part of the Russian Jews, confirms it unmistakably. The Soviet Government, historically minded as it is, knows full well how many

complications Jewish assimilation entails. Is it, then, unreasonable to assert that the Government itself must find the results of its work far from satisfactory? Is it prepared to recognise that only in free collaboration with a self-governing Russian Jewry could the problem be brought nearer a solution?

Without its question mark, the last sentence not only represents an attempt to explain why the Soviet struggle against anti-Semitism lacked unity of purpose and why it repeatedly missed its goal, but also points to the necessity of free collaboration between the Jews and their defenders as a primary condition of a successful policy of defence. True defence is always self-defence.

There are also other conclusions to be drawn from the Soviet experience. The Jewish people are essentially an international body. Stalin may have believed that it was possible to build up "Socialism in one country." Even so, there is no possibility of solving the Jewish question "in one country only." Like the Jewish people, its shadow, the anti-Semitic movement, is an international phenomenon. Either it will be banished from the whole surface of the earth, or it will remain ubiquitous. This is a conclusion which, if correct, must be borne in mind always and everywhere.

The last conclusion which may be drawn from the experience in Soviet Russia is of even wider scope. It reveals a uniformity in the evolution of Jewish life which brings together epochs as far apart as the epoch of emancipation in the European West and that in contemporary Russia. This means that Jewish politics, as well as the policies of non-Jews with regard to any part of the Jewish people, are bound to lead everybody astray if they are not based on thorough knowledge of the fundamental laws governing its past. The Jewish people is one indissoluble whole not only in Space, but also in Time.

Great Britain and the Jews

Particular Problems

By

M. CORBETT ASHBY

IT seems a paradox, but in the long run anti-Semitism is even more dangerous to the oppressors than to the victims. To us in Britain the full urgency of the problem is not always apparent, especially in its early stages. This is understandable. Before the war, which, although it began officially in 1939, started at least six years earlier, anti-Semitism was not a noticeable element in our social behaviour. In fact this country was singularly free of it. True, in small ways there was discrimination against Jews, and the seed of anti-Semitism was there, but this affected isolated individuals rather than groups or large numbers. The minute proportion of Jews to the total population of the country was partly responsible; and it is worth noting that any anti-Jewish manifestations were to be found in districts and towns where the proportion of Jews was much higher—as, for example, in the East End of London, Manchester or Leeds, where Jews could be identified as a distinguishable community. (At the same time, it must be pointed out that the Irish Catholics of Liverpool, for instance, were sufficient in number to represent a kind of community suggesting something different or alien to the average Englishman.) Nevertheless, when Oswald Mosley organised his anti-Jewish demonstration and tried to march his thugs through the East End of London, it was not only the Jews, as such, who drove him away. The workers generally, Jews and Gentiles, combined to defeat him, solid in their hatred of Fascism.

In Germany the story was very different, and the repercussions were felt in Britain. When Hitler seized power this meant yet another of history's long series of Jewish dispersions. And, naturally enough, along with other refugees, religious and political, they made for the democratic countries.

The years of depression, which had largely contributed to putting Hitler into power, had had their effect on the rest of the world. This foreign immigration into England was viewed with suspicion as a source of competition in the labour market. During those pre-war years we extended a measure of hospitality to the victims of the Nazis; but our national record of resistance to Nazi

aggression and principles was a poor one. Nazi propaganda reaped some harvest in England as elsewhere.

With the outbreak of the war, and the overwhelming of Poland, Hitler proceeded with his gigantic project of exterminating the Jews. The plight of these stricken people has roused deep indignation and horror all over the civilised world; and all clear-thinking men and women must agree that the defeat and disappearance of anti-Semitism are inextricably bound up with the defeat of Hitler.

Yet public feeling against these atrocities, though expressed in the most solemn terms in the House of Commons, is not enough. Anti-Semitism is a dangerous reality even in its very earliest stages, and must be tackled as a positive problem. If we begin at the beginning, with the prejudice against Jews, we find that it is linked up with the feeling that they are a separate community, racial and religious. Racially, of course, they are as diverse as the English themselves. It is their historic series of misfortunes, forcing them to band together for protection, and the age-long continuity of their religious beliefs and practices, which make them seem so alien in the countries where they have sought refuge, as well as the fact that they have assimilated the way of life of the community from which they come, Polish, Russian, Hungarian, etc. All these foreign ways of life, difficult to cast off, intensify the difference between them and the British workers with whom they must live.

Many charges are levelled at them, and thoughtlessly accepted by people who have never attempted to analyse the evidence. For example, the Jew is blamed for the black market, but his judges do not stop to consider that for every Jewish offender listed as operating on the black market there are Smiths and Jones and Browns, names which carry no sensation value. Nor would the publication of them pander to the desire to fix the blame on an "un-English" source. The accusers forget that the black market depends on the consumer, and that he or she is just as guilty as the seller. They do not reflect that the black market developed as naturally in Italy, where the proportion of Jews to Italians is infinitesimal, or as in America during the period of prohibition, where the famous names in the bootlegging market were Italian rather than Jewish. They forget that the "news" value of black-market operations is altogether out of proportion to its size in this country. Here it is smaller than in most other countries: certainly smaller than in occupied Europe, where the Jew has been so viciously eliminated.

The Jew is accused of monopolising certain occupations and

trades and refusing to engage in others—for example, agriculture or any kind of manual labour. He is reputed to crowd into “middle-man” positions and commercial undertakings generally, where the profit is great and the physical exertion small, where he need not dirty his hands. It is forgotten that in the past agriculture, then the main occupation, and many other jobs were closed by law to the Jew. Naturally he has tended to cluster in and stick to those which have been traditionally open to him. It is also forgotten that now, with wartime expansion of industries, the Jew has been directed into the factory, where he has played his part as faithfully as any other kind of worker. To answer the ridiculous criticism that no Jew is ever a tiller of the soil, or remotely interested in the countryside, one has only to turn to Palestine, where I have seen that the Jew, by his own energy and enthusiasm, has transformed the desert into some of the finest agricultural land in the world.

In the same way the popular myth of “international financial Jewry,” fostered by the Nazis and presumably those who are far in agreement with the Nazis, can be exploded. An examination of the list of directors of the Bank of England would reveal no Jews among them. Neither in banking nor in the newspaper world, surely a sphere of considerable influence, are the big names Jewish.

As in the last war the Jew is accused of evading military service; of seeking the safe, “cushy” job; of being less “brave” than the rest of us. Those who condemn should examine the relevant figures. Ten per cent of the general population of Great Britain is in the Armed Forces, whereas thirteen per cent of the Jewish population is in uniform. Jews have died for democracy along with their Gentile comrades in Crete, Greece, Singapore, Burma and on the beaches of Dunkirk. They have received high military awards for gallantry, and the first woman to receive the B.E.M. for unusual bravery in an air raid was a young Jewish girl (Miss Rosalie Gassman) in April 1941. The foreign Jews in this country have rallied to the ranks of the Pioneer Corps, and later have joined up with their own Allied Armies formed here. Is it a good omen for their future in this country that they apparently prefer to fight in the British Army?

After the war many refugees will wish to return to their own lands, including Jews who regard themselves primarily as citizens of the countries of their origin. But it is likely that many of the victims of Hitler's terror in Germany will elect to stay here where they have known respite from the Gestapo, and where, in spite of the restrictions and hardships of wartime, they have been able

to build up homes and jobs. Many foreign Jews have been absorbed into war industries, where they have worked happily and conscientiously beside their British fellow-workers notwithstanding language difficulties and differences in social and cultural background. A careful survey by the National Council for Civil Liberties shows that there has been no friction in these workshops except in a few instances, where the English workpeople themselves traced the trouble to the activities of ex-members of the British Union of Fascists. These refugees have earned their place in our country and should be welcome to stay here in accordance with our centuries-old tradition of hospitality to the stranger.

Among the Jews who have found refuge here there are many who have contributed to our economic resources by bringing with them their own specialised industries, in which they have employed British workers. They have, in fact, helped to relieve the situation in some of the so-called "Special Areas" where unemployment was at a very high peak before the war, and where they have built new factories, imparted trade secrets, and given us new connections in the overseas market of great consequence for our post-war export trade. When war came these specialist industries were turned over to the national effort, along with many other British industries which catered normally for peacetime consumption. It would be a betrayal of our national sagacity, apart from considerations of hospitality, if we failed to give these people the right to stay here and become part of our national life. To all the refugees who have worked for the war effort, in industry, in the Services, or in the fields of science and medicine, naturalisation should be offered without hesitation.

The call-up to industry and the Services has split up and separated families of all kinds and classes, and this may have the effect of mitigating the resentment felt against the Jews for their "community" character. Jews have gone into a greater diversity of jobs than ever before, and their contacts with other people have, therefore, become more individual. It is hard to imagine that the end of the war will see them returning to the isolation of the Jewish quarters in the big cities. The war has, of course, particularly affected the young people, who in any case are more adventurous and "assimilable" than their more orthodox elders. If the idea of a "racial" community can be dispelled it is surely not too much to hope that tolerance will be extended to the religious practices of the Jews in this country, where so much blood has been shed to achieve religious toleration.

With regard to a Jewish National Home, I am a whole-hearted Zionist, and believe that the establishment of a Jewish State in Palestine, either as a member of an Eastern federation of states or of the British Commonwealth of Nations, would be the first step towards a permanent settlement of the problem. I do not suggest for a moment, however, that those Jews who are American, Dutch, English or Norwegian, should be regarded as alien in their own countries, where their families may have been part of the fabric of the nation for hundreds of years; these people are American, Dutch or English because they have chosen to be so as free citizens. But Palestine should offer a home and national identity to those Jews to whom their European homes have become anathema, and to those who feel an historical link with Palestine.

There are, of course, many difficulties in the way of such a settlement. It is essential that the Arabs should have a fair deal if they are to accept with goodwill the idea of Palestine as the National State of the Jews; and it is also essential that Palestine as a Jewish State should not practise racial discrimination against the Arabs. With the liberation from Fascism of North Africa there is new hope for the Arabs, and in my opinion assistance to the new Arab States should be conditional on their acceptance of Palestine as a Jewish National State.

It is perhaps idle to speculate on possible solutions of the Jewish problem, as such, since it is inseparable from all the other social, economic and political problems produced by the chaos of the between-the-wars period. If future governments in this country are dominated by big financial and industrial interests and pursue the old restrictive policies, producing a crescendo of unemployment and a deterioration of our relations with other countries, then we will have come full circle. There will be an outcry against any helpless category of worker, foreigners, Jews—or women. Anti-Semitism will be invoked. Women will be sent back to their homes, no matter how poverty-stricken. And there will be war again.

But if we can pursue energetically the policy of full employment and recognise that the work of each individual raises the standard of living for all, if we are determined to stand for equality of opportunity for all without discrimination against class, race or sex, then we shall see that our Jewish visitors have added a richness of texture to our national make-up. In our history we have absorbed easily each new element and used it to add to the fullness and diversity of our national life.

Great Britain and the Refugees

By

SIR NORMAN ANGELL

THERE are at present about 150,000 refugees in this country. As the end of the war approaches, the question as to what will become of the refugees after the war becomes more and more urgent. Have we room for the refugees in this country? Will they be wanted in the Empire? Are refugees to be considered as an asset or a liability?

Whereas most of the other contributors to the volume have dealt with problems concerning the Jews from the point of view of the Jews, it is proposed to examine, discuss and to attempt to reach an answer to the above questions by considering them from the point of view of the countries concerned. The Jews constitute a large proportion of the refugees in this country; therefore the general conclusions reached will have a direct bearing on them.

The Australian Government recently appointed a Departmental Committee to examine the problem of post-war immigration. It is reported that, among its preliminary findings, is one to the effect that Australia could absorb twenty million additional workers. This would mean, with the wives and children, a still larger addition to the population.

Similar investigations of a non-governmental character in Canada indicate that that country could absorb an even greater number of workers, and so a still larger addition of population. New Zealand, about the size of England and Wales, has a population of a million and a half, while England and Wales have a population more than twenty times as great. South Africa, with a coloured population four times as great as the white population of two millions, could probably multiply its white population several times. The Rhodesias and Kenya, also suitable for white settlement, could absorb considerable numbers.

The chief overseas Dominions could, in the view of many who have examined the matter, provide for a population of at least a hundred million.

Where would they get this population? Not from Britain, if present population trends continue. Professor Carr-Saunders, who is one of the great authorities on population problems, declared a

year or two since that, "if the birth-rate does not rise very sharply in the near future" we shall, in the lifetime of persons now living, have a Britain with little more than half its present population. Indeed, in the years preceding the war there was not, on balance, any addition at all to the population of the Dominions from Britain. The balance was the other way: more came from the Dominions into Britain than went out from Britain to the Dominions.

This tendency has been constant and increasing over a number of years. During the years 1924-29, the average annual net number of emigrants of British nationality from Great Britain and Northern Ireland to destinations outside Europe was 92,341. In 1930, it fell to 25,955. During the three years 1930-33, the tide turned, and there was an annual excess of immigrants over emigrants amounting to an average of 39,582.

Nor can the Dominions provide for much increase from their own stock. Indeed, the tendency towards a stationary or declining population is nearly as pronounced in Australia, and New Zealand, and in English-speaking Canada, as it is in this country, or indeed in all "westernised" countries, including the United States. For the paradox of this population problem is that, in countries where the standard of life is high, the birth-rate is usually low; and, where the standard of life is low, the birth-rate is high. The present lift in the birth-rate in Britain is hardly, therefore, something upon which we can calculate with any assurance, in view of the long-continued contrary tendency. But, while population thus declines in Britain, it does not decline in China, or India, or Russia, so that, in the not very distant future as history goes, a Britain of twenty-five millions may be contemporaneous with a Russia of three or four hundred millions, a China of five or six hundred millions, and an India of four or five hundred millions.

We have, therefore, to visualise a situation in which, if present restrictions upon immigration are maintained, the population of the whole white Commonwealth will have fallen to forty millions or thereabouts, at a time when Russia alone may have a population ten times as large; with a thousand million Chinese and Indians in the background.

There are disturbing political possibilities in the picture.

Let us consider economic facts.

We may suppose for a moment that those twenty million additional workers, together with their families, of whom the Australian Committee has spoken, had actually formed on the continent of

Australia a new State or Dominion; a country, that is, with the population of Spain. Would the present Australian population of seven millions find it disadvantageous economically to have a State of twenty millions or more at their doors? Or, indeed, to be added to their Federation? Would they resent a market of twenty million souls? Would an Australia of thirty millions be necessarily less prosperous than one of seven millions?

Yet, we know there are severe restrictions in Australia and other Dominions, and in Great Britain, upon immigration, restrictions which have the effect of keeping the population down; restrictions based largely upon the view that immigration increases unemployment, and that every immigrant admitted is likely to deprive a man at home of his job. The facts of experience, as well as economic research and science, prove that assumption, or theory, to be completely fallacious. It is a mischievous fallacy, dangerous and damaging to the welfare and security of the Commonwealth.

We will consider a few facts of history that bear upon it. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the United States had a population of about seven millions. Suppose the population of the United States had remained at that figure instead of becoming one of a hundred and thirty millions? Would the seven millions necessarily have been more prosperous? At the time when the United States had seven million people, the maps marked most of the country simply as "The Great American Desert." There is to-day no Great American Desert. Vast stretches of it have been reclaimed. Irrigation, roads, railroads, dams, power development, have conquered it. But would the great trans-continental railroads, the irrigation schemes, the dams, the power development, have been possible at all if the population had remained at seven millions?

No sane man doubts the answer. If the population of what is now the United States had remained at seven millions it would have been a poorer population, individually as well as collectively, than the hundred and thirty millions who now inhabit that territory.

Yet, at the beginning of the nineteenth century, when the country had a population of about seven millions, there were violent agitations to impose restriction upon immigration and even prohibit it. As it was, it was argued, there was not enough work for the existing population. The blacksmiths and builders and painters and tailors and metal workers were hard put to it to find work. Why bring in all these foreigners to make matters worse? There were serious riots in the towns against newcomers. The New

Englishmen rioted against the Irish, and, later, the Irish against "Dutchmen" (Germans); these against the Italians, and all against the Negroes and the Chinese. All alike were persuaded that there were not enough jobs to go round.

But, in fact, the greater the number of immigrants the more jobs there were. Never was employment so booming as when the country was receiving a million or more emigrants every year. For this new population meant new houses, new cities, new railroads, new schools, new theatres, new newspapers, more clothes to make, more factories in which to make them, more machinery, more doctors, more dentists, more teachers. Business tends to be good when population is expanding, as it tends to be bad when population is declining. (Imagine Britain in the period forecast by the experts when it will have half its present population! What will happen to the building trade with something like half the houses empty? To railroad workers with traffic cut to a half? To the cinema industry with audiences cut to a half? To newspapers with circulations cut to a half? . . .)

It is clear that if the agitations in favour of restriction had been successful early in the history of the United States, that country could never have become at all the country we know; its achievements in providing a high standard of life for a hundred and thirty million people, most of them workers, would never have been possible.

Now the British Commonwealth stands, as to much of its area, somewhat in the position that America stood in a century ago: a great field for potential development. Is it to apply the restrictive or the liberal policy in the matter of migration and immigration?

It will be said that this is not mainly the affair of Britain, but of the Dominions, who are independent, self-governing nations. While it is true that it is not for us to dictate to the Dominions what they shall do, it may well fall to us to set an example, to lead the way, and to suggest and counsel one policy as against another. At the close of this war there will be vast multitudes of uprooted folk, victims of the Nazi slave-raiding, who will want a chance of starting life afresh. Is most of the British Commonwealth, including Britain, to be closed to them? If so, the decision to exclude them will not make for peace, and will not make for prosperity.

We must hammer at this fallacy that every immigrant or refugee who gets a job "takes it from an Englishman." In the light of what has just been written, the refugee is much more likely to

create jobs for Englishmen. An Englishman, it is true, may apply for a job in an office and find a refugee occupying it, and, not unnaturally, argue that he has been done out of work. But suppose the refugee happens to be there because, with his knowledge of foreign markets—originally supplied by, say, Germany—he is able so to enlarge the firm's business that a hundred extra men are taken on in the factory? To refuse to employ the refugee might well have meant depriving ninety-nine Englishmen of work in order that one particular individual might get a job.

This is not a fantastic case that never arises. It arises very often, and will do so still more often as we have to build up new markets and cultivate new fields of enterprise all over the world.

In this matter magnanimity and interest go hand in hand.

Political Status of the Jews in Post-War Europe

By

DR. LEV ZELMANOVITS

ANY attempt to visualise the situation in which the remnants of European Jewry will find themselves after the war, may be regarded as a courageous enterprise. This is especially true when consideration is devoted to the future *political status* of those who will survive the massacres to which the Jewish population has been and is being subjected in all German-occupied territories. Any attempt, however, to deal with the conditions under which the surviving Jews and those returning from exile will have to live in post-war Europe would be incomplete if it did not take into account this aspect of the problem. For it is clear that the variety of problems which confront us in reviewing the post-war situation—e.g., the question of relief and rehabilitation, repatriation, restitution of property, etc., etc.—are all closely inter-connected with the political status which Jews will enjoy in the liberated territories of Europe.

From their experiences of the last twenty-five years, Jews and non-Jews must surely realise that any attempt to regularise the position of Jews who will have to remain in Europe, must be based on their re-integration into the economic life of their respective countries, as well as upon proper safeguards of their political status in those countries. The twenty years' existence of the Protection of Minorities must necessarily influence any proposal for a future solution. For Jewish demands at the Peace Conference in 1919 were, to a great extent, responsible for the creation of this system and its application affected Jews wherever minority treaties existed.

The Protection of Minorities of 1919 and its Relative Failure

Since the Congress of Vienna in 1814, when the question of safeguarding the equality of religious minority groups was embodied in the International Treaty, there has hardly been an International conference concluding hostilities between European countries or regulating their relations, which has not—directly or indirectly—dealt with the position of the Jewish populations. The Paris Con

ference of 1856, the Congress of Paris in 1858, the Congress of Berlin in 1878 and the Peace Conference in Bucharest in 1913, all established important precedents by which the principal Allied and Associated Powers felt bound in 1919. At the conclusion of a war in which the "right of self-determination" of all peoples—great or small, weak or strong—was repeatedly and authoritatively declared to be one of the main war aims, a reconsidered and more mature approach to this problem was to be expected.

That a real climax was reached by the establishment of the "Protection of Minorities" under the guarantee of the League of Nations can hardly be denied. It is evident that the Peace Conference of 1919 went far beyond all precedents of the nineteenth century.

The Jewish attitude at that time towards the Minorities Treaties seems to be best expressed in a letter written by Louis Marshall, Cyrus Adler and Nahum Sokolow (three leading members of the Committee of Jewish Delegations at the Peace Conference) dated July 11th, 1919—in which they stated:¹

"These rights of minorities are declared by the treaty to be matters of international concern . . . this is an act of the first magnitude. In truth it constitutes a genuine charter of liberty for all minorities because its effectiveness is guaranteed by the sanction of the Covenant of the League of Nations. . . . The Minorities Treaties have, at last, absolved the Jews of Eastern Europe from the serious disabilities from which they have so long suffered and will for ever end the grave abuse of the past. They will enable the Jews as well as all other minorities to live their own lives and to develop their own culture."

It is significant that such outstanding Jewish leaders expressed the opinion quoted above, despite the fact that the Minorities Treaties realised Jewish demands only to a small extent. Their "more ambitious" proposals—such as to recognise the minorities as national entities, to allow them proportional representation through national curiae, to facilitate the observance of the Jewish Sabbath by exempting Jews from regulations prohibiting work on Sundays—were not accepted. But in spite of this the Jewish leaders, and with them the Jewish masses, realised what great progress had been achieved, that *under international guarantee*,

(a) their full and complete protection of life and liberty was assured, without distinction of birth, nationality, language, race or religion;

¹O. I. Janovsky, *The Jews and Minority Rights*, p. 389.

(b) they would be able to enjoy complete equality before the law and all civil and political rights—without distinction as to race, language or religion;

(c) their citizenship rights in their countries of birth and/or permanent residence were assured, according to regulations defining their rights thereto;

(d) they were safeguarded against any kind of linguistic or cultural oppression, having secured “in law and in fact” the same treatment as other nationals of their respective countries.

Apart from these general minority rights, there were special clauses in the Treaty with Poland, concerning Jewish education, and the right to observe the Jewish Sabbath; and in the Treaty with Rumania, special regulations concerning the citizenship of Jewish inhabitants. Therefore it was firmly believed in Jewish circles that “a better era was now dawning.”

To-day, however, looking back in retrospect to the era which followed the Peace Conference, and reviewing the armistice period between the two world wars, there seems to be unanimity of opinion about the inadequacy of the “Protection of Minorities” created in 1919. Yet, although it is clear that the “Minority system” did not bring about a satisfactory solution either of the minority problem in general, or of the Jewish position in particular, it would be unfair and unwise to reject the whole system without recognising the soundness of its basic principles and the positive results it was able to achieve. In order to draw proper conclusions for the future it seems necessary to analyse all the factors which prevented a satisfactory development of this system. To do this effectively, one has to distinguish between the deficiencies of the system itself on the one hand, and on the other hand the general conditions under which its working had to be conducted.

There can be no dispute about the fact that the stipulations of the Minorities Treaties of 1919 and the various subsidiary stipulations were in spite of their progressive character far from perfect, as far as their practical application was concerned. One of the basic mistakes was undoubtedly the fact that the obligations concerning the Protection of Minorities were imposed only upon a small number of states, thus creating discrimination between League of Nations members. The result of this deficiency was that certain states which had themselves oppressed their minorities without fear of lawful interference from outside, could easily assume the role of accusers of other countries which were known to be tolerant to their minorities but were bound by treaty obligations to international

control. The procedure adopted by the League of Nations was far too complicated and "theoretical" to ensure smooth working of the system. It was certainly wrong that the rights of the complaining individuals or groups were restricted to the submission of petitions only, which being regarded as "pure information" had to be taken up by one of the Council's members in order to initiate a proper procedure. The natural result of such a regulation was the creation of *Mutterstaaten*—states which, for political reasons, became the "protecting powers" of their kinsmen in other countries and their advocates in the League of Nations. The inadequate and very often superficial wording of the treaty stipulations at the outset left open to certain countries the desired opportunity to place upon these stipulations an interpretation which was obviously not in accord with the spirit and basic ideas of the treaties. The real reasons, however, for the deplorable failure cannot be found in the Minority system itself but in the general conditions under which it was supposed to function.

Since the Protection of Minorities was a by-product of the League of Nations' idea, it was, naturally, *a priori* dependent for its whole development on the evolution of the League and its various organs. Therefore, upon the success or failure of the League rested the fate of the Minority system. It is obviously impossible, in the space of these observations, to go thoroughly into the various reasons which brought about the decline of the League's authority and finally resulted in its complete collapse. One of the main reasons which is generally recognised to-day was its lack of executive power. This, with the consequent failure to render any of the decisions effective, was felt especially in the realisation of the Minorities Treaties. Members of the League of Nations who were ill-disposed to the Minorities Treaties soon became aware of these deficiencies and were quick to take advantage of them. On the other hand, the League of Nations itself, realising its inability to impose decisions on its members, naturally tried to achieve compromises "under any circumstances," so as to avoid unduly publicising its weaknesses. It is small wonder, therefore, that developments took such a turn that one of the member-states¹ declared, one-sidedly and suddenly, that it no longer adhered to the obligations of the Minorities Treaties, and the League of Nations simply had to acknowledge the fact, even though "under protest."

Bearing these facts in mind, it is only fair to state that the relative failure of the "Protection of Minorities" was due mainly, if not

¹ Poland, in 1934, through Col. Beck.

entirely, to the collapse of the machinery of the League of Nations on which it was founded. The soundness of the basic principles of an international protection for certain groups of individuals remains unchallenged; moreover, it seems that the events which the civilised world has witnessed during the last twenty years have proved beyond doubt that an effective protection of certain rights of individuals and groups is absolutely necessary in any future attempt to organise the life of nations.

European Jewry Between the Two World Wars

The Jewish population of Europe had every reason to complain about the ineffectiveness of the Protection of Minorities as practised under the auspices of the League of Nations between the two world wars. *Numerus clausus*, economic boycott, denial of citizenship rights, and a hundred other discriminatory measures, were well established in countries bound by Minorities Treaties. The fact that stipulations concerning "full equality before the law" assuring "the equal enjoyment of civil and political rights without distinction of race, language or religion" were embodied in almost all Constitutions as the fundamental laws of States which concluded Minorities Treaties, did not prevent most of these States from rendering ineffective, by administrative measures, the principles implicit in the Minorities Treaties. It is very significant that despite this well-known situation, Jews of all countries concerned "looked upon the appeal to an international body as a measure of last resort. Long experience has taught them that winning a case against their own Government was often a Pyrrhic victory at best. For this reason, despite their many valid grievances, the Jewish minorities submitted only a negligible number of petitions."¹ It was typical of the Jewish attitude to wage its war against discrimination within the country, by fighting the respective administration in Parliaments, in state and municipal bodies, through the medium of the Press and through other means of influencing public opinion, and as far as possible, to deal with these domestic affairs without external interference.

Although the Minorities Treaties did not by any means realise the hopes placed in them by the Jews concerned, it must, however, be pointed out that the very existence of these obligations certainly proved beneficial on many occasions. There can be no doubt that many a hardship was prevented, or at least alleviated,

¹ Jacob Robinson, *Were the Minorities Treaties a Failure?* p. 248.

by the fear of the reactions which would be produced at the international forum, the League of Nations Council and the Assembly. At least during a certain period all the states concerned tried hard to avoid any kind of an international discussion of their internal conditions. They knew that any visible violation of their minority obligations could in consequence lead to a development which would be harmful to their prestige and reputation.

The most important positive experience from the Jewish point of view in this respect was the famous "Bernheim Petition."

After the Nazis had seized power in 1933, the Jewish population of Germany became the object of most brutal persecution; the outstanding feature of this policy was wholesale confiscation of property, robbery, desecration of cemeteries, burning of synagogues, the most inhuman ill-treatment of innocent men, women and children, the creation of concentration camps, as well as systematically organised pogroms which were perpetrated with the knowledge, consent and direction of the German Government. At that time, the whole of the civilised world, and world Jewry especially, looked to the League of Nations and its representatives to take measures to stem the tide of these acts of bestiality perpetrated by an official European Government represented in the League of Nations. The sole reaction was that there were waves of more or less sincere protest and statements denouncing this inhuman treatment. It was, however, the general attitude that nothing effective could be done because, according to the existing international laws, the treatment meted out to Jewish citizens in Germany had to be regarded as "an internal affair of the German Reich," which, although a defeated country in 1918, had no minority obligations imposed upon her.

There was, however, one exception in the international legal position of the German Reich—at first sight it seemed rather an insignificant one from the Jewish point of view. A bilateral Convention, concluded in 1922 between Germany and Poland relating to Upper Silesia, provided that the Minority Treaties included in the Peace Treaty with Poland should be applicable to those parts of Upper Silesia specifically recognised as part of Poland; and on the other hand that "*the German Government should be bound to accept for the transitional period of fifteen years the same obligations as regards those parts of Upper Silesia definitely recognised as part of Germany.*" Thus, the stipulations of the Minorities Treaties were extended to the territory of Upper Silesia allocated to Germany—the Jewish population of which numbered only

10,069 souls, out of a total Jewish population in Germany of some 502,000.

Based on this legal position, a petition was submitted to the League of Nations in May 1933 on behalf of a Jewish citizen of Upper Silesia, Franz Bernheim, complaining about "the application of inequality to German nationals of non-Aryan—i.e., Jewish descent" in all spheres of private and public life.¹

The result was unexpected. The League entrusted a special Committee of International Lawyers to study the whole question. This Committee decided that Jews in Upper Silesia are a "racial minority" within the meaning of the Convention; thus the German representative, von Keller, was finally compelled to declare at the League's Council (*verbatim*): "*It is obvious that the international conventions concluded by Germany cannot be affected by internal German legislation.* Should the provisions of the Geneva Convention have been violated in German Upper Silesia, this can only be due to mistakes on the part of subordinate organs acting under a mistaken interpretation of the laws."² Thereupon, a number of decrees were published by the Prussian Ministry of Justice and by various Provincial authorities of German Upper Silesia, to the effect that all anti-Jewish legislation in this part of the German Reich was cancelled. Even the Nazi party issued a special order forbidding anti-Jewish propaganda in this territory in which, consequently, the Nuremberg Laws were not applicable.³

The practical result of the famous Bernheim Petition since that time cannot be overestimated, even though it concerned "only" 10,069 Jews most of whom were thus saved physically. But apart from the actual number of Jews saved, the importance lies in the principles which were involved. Bound by international obligations, even Hitler's Nazi Government had to give in. Nobody would dare to suggest that this or other similar events could have changed the catastrophic developments which have swept over Europe since 1933. But imagine what would have been the result if, based on international treaties, the civilised world had actually been able to exert pressure upon Germany to cancel, even temporarily, the Nuremberg Laws in the whole of the German Reich! What would have been the extent to which such action would have influenced the whole Nazi machinery in the decisive period of its establishment! How many more than the 10,069 Jewish souls could thus have been saved!

¹ G. Kaackenbeck, *The International Experiment of Upper Silesia*, p. 262.

² Official Journal, League of Nations, July 1933, No. 3281, p. 823.

³ Dr. K. Stillshweig, "*Die Juden Osteuropas in den Minderheits Verträgen.*"

In 1919, however, the Allied Powers were of the opinion that "it would have been completely contrary to the whole principles by which the Minority Treaties could be justified, if similar obligations had been imposed upon Germany . . . where no local circumstances were of such a nature as to make it probable that safeguards of this kind were requisite."¹

* The developments in Germany since 1933 have proved how wrong the responsible statesmen were in their judgment in 1919. Moreover, the "Bernheim Case" has shown beyond all doubt the significance of international obligations and the inestimable importance of an international protection of the basic human rights of certain individuals and groups. Jews and non-Jews alike, when considering any safeguarding of the future peace order, should therefore not confine their analysis only to the negative results of the "Minority system." It seems appropriate that first of all the reasons should be analysed which have caused the deplorable development, and secondly, that fair account should be taken also of the (even if very limited) positive experience such as the case of German Upper Silesia. And finally it has to be remembered that in spite of all possible criticism of the "Minority system" in the past, the "Minority problem" will still remain after this war and, consequently, ways and means have to be considered in order to cope with it in the future.

It is significant that one of the most experienced British statesmen in the field of international collaboration, Lord Cecil, expressed in a recent debate in the House of Lords the following view about the Minority Treaties of 1919: "I quite recognise the difficulty of the position but I hope that something of the same kind will find its way into any final settlement at which we arrive after this war."²

The Eternal Problem

"The eternal problem presented by the Jewish Question stirs men to-day as it did ages ago. It remains unsolved, like the squaring of the circle, but unlike it, it is still a burning question. This is due to the fact that it is not merely a problem of theoretic interest, but one of practical interest, which renews its youth from day to day, as it were, and presses more and more imperatively for a solution."

"The essence of the problem lies in the fact that, in the midst of the nations among whom the Jews reside, they form a distinctive

¹ H. W. V. Temperley, *A History of the Peace Conference of Paris*, Vol. V, page 142.

² *Hansard*, House of Lords, Vol. 130, No. 29, 8th March, 1944, p. 1,113.

element which cannot be assimilated. . . . The millennium in which the nations will merge into humanity, is still invisible in the distance . . . but in the interim the relations of the nations to one another may be adjusted fairly well by an explicit mutual understanding, an understanding based upon international law, treaties, and especially upon a certain equality in rank and mutually admitted rights, as well as upon mutual regard."

This analysis written as far back as 1882 by Dr. Leo Pinsker, one of the predecessors of modern Zionism, in his pamphlet *Auto-Emancipation*¹ expresses with a correctness which can hardly be challenged the Jewish problem with which Jews in the Diaspora are and will be faced some sixty-two years later.

It is certainly premature to go into the details of the future position of the various Jewish communities in Europe after the war. It is obvious that the Jewish problem—as most of the other problems—will finally be influenced by various circumstances, which no one can foresee to-day. There cannot be any doubt that of most decisive influence will be the actual conditions in which the remnants of European Jewry will successfully survive, their physical and moral situation, their numerical strength; whether psychologically they will be more inclined to remain in their former places of domicile or whether they will prefer to emigrate, how great will be their energies to rebuild lost positions, etc., etc. Those Jews, however, who will remain in Europe—however big or how small their number may be in the various countries—will again be faced with the eternal problem: a distinctive element among other nations.

Although Jews as individuals as well as collectives have proved in the past to be the most loyal citizens of their countries, it seems as if they too may be affected by the "horror of minorities" now common to many influential circles and to some nations as a whole. There seems to be a danger that the attitude of "revenge" which prevails against the "fifth-column minorities" could in future consciously or subconsciously be extended against Jews too. Apart from this very fact, however, one has to envisage that the poisonous anti-Semitic propaganda of the Nazis will certainly leave throughout Europe visible and sensible effects which easily might increase when economic difficulties will arise in the post-war period. Such developments have to be foreseen especially in the various satellite countries as well as among not unimportant parts of the population in certain Allied countries. Finally one has to admit

¹ Dr. Leo Pinsker, *Auto-Emancipation*, p. 15 (English translation published by the Zionist Federation of Great Britain, 1932).

that the various post-war problems, such as for instance, rehabilitation, repatriation, punishment of war criminals, restitution of properties, etc., constitute by their very nature and by their manifold implications an easily inflammable material, which might be a welcome excuse for ill-minded elements to sever again the relations between Jews and non-Jews.

Thus once again the question has to be solved, whether the fate of a "distinctive group of citizen" should be regarded as solely an internal affair of the State concerned or whether the human society as such has the right and duty to protect such a group against ill-treatment, oppression and discrimination.

From this point of view it is immaterial whether Jews regard themselves or are regarded as a "minority" in the political sense of this term. In their demands for the *basic rights of men* Jews are entitled to seek international protection as collective-minority groups as well as individuals. After the experience of the period during the two world wars and after the defeat of Fascism and Nazism a civilised world will hardly be able to deny that such a demand put forward by the eternal victim and scapegoat of nationalistic outrages is reasonable and just. After the events which the world has witnessed in Germany and Europe since 1933 it should be clear that the "Jewish question" is not a problem which concerns Jews only. The Gentile world should have learned that this problem is of a much wider character and can easily become a stepping-stone to the arousing of the lowest emotions and darkest forces in human society.

It cannot be doubted that it is one of the first duties of any orderly organised community to prevent disturbances of a safe and peaceful community life by timely established regulations and firm measures. The organisation therefore which will have to prepare and protect the future world order will be bound to deal in time with the unique problem of the Jewish situation in the Diaspora. It will have to adopt appropriate measures to prevent the abuse of the Jewish problem as a pretext for hate propaganda, disturbing the peaceful life of national groups and of nations as a whole.

Fundamental Conditions of any Future Solution

It is not the intention of this essay to examine the details of measures which will be necessary in order to "solve" the Jewish problem in general or its European aspect in particular. It would go far beyond the subject-matter even to indicate what important

influence Palestine as a Jewish State or Commonwealth will have on the position of Jews in the world and especially in Europe.¹ The present considerations intend merely to emphasise what are the indispensable basic principles on which any future approach to the Jewish problem (especially in Central and Eastern Europe) will have to be based if the often repeated slogans of justice, humanity and human dignity should not remain platitudes only.

The first fundamental principle is *complete equality in law and fact*. There is no doubt that based on the "Four Freedoms," the Atlantic Charter and the Moscow Declaration, certain basic human rights (protection of life and liberty, economic and social security, etc., for all inhabitants without any distinction) will be regarded as minimum conditions of any national constitution after this war. In this respect, however, account should be taken of a view expressed by the Permanent Court of International Justice which stated:

"Equality in law precludes discrimination of any kind; whereas equality in fact may involve the necessity of different treatment in order to attain a result which establishes an equilibrium between different situations."²

This is a clear reference to the danger of *administrative discrimination*, which by "appropriate" interpretation of the existing laws willingly overlooks the different conditions to which certain citizens or certain groups of citizens are exposed, and thus creates for them visible disadvantages. "Opportunities for officials, especially where State intervention is developed, to take into account national or other considerations in their decisions, and to deal out their favours or refusals unevenly, are extremely numerous and are but too often used and even abused."^{3, 4}

Should the stipulations regarding "equality" not remain once again dead letters, appropriate measures will be necessary which

¹ See the contributions of Mrs. B. Dugdale, Dr. J. Heller and S. Adler-Rudel in this publication.

² P.C.I.J. Series A/B, No. 64, 1935, p. 19.

³ G. Kaeckenbeck, *The International Experiment of Upper Silesia*, p. 254.

⁴ It has to be noted with great satisfaction, that one of the most important international organisations recently established, i.e., the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration, has paid due attention to the inevitable possibility of "difference of conditions." The resolution dealing with "non-discriminations" as adopted at the Atlantic City Conference not only expresses the obvious principle, that U.N.R.R.A.'s activities have to be conducted "without discrimination of race, creed or political belief," but adds that "resources, relief and rehabilitation in all its aspects shall be distributed or dispensed *fairly on the basis of the relative needs of the population*." In determining "relative needs, there may be taken into account the diverse needs caused by *discriminatory treatment by the enemy during its occupation*." (Resolution No. 2 of the U.N.R.R.A. Conference, Atlantic City, 1st December, 1943.)

would safeguard such laws against ill-minded application and interpretation.

Having disposed of the problems concerning Jews and their rights and duties as individual citizens of the respective countries by full and complete "equality in law and in fact," the second principle which has to be considered is the position of *Jews as a collective* within the various national or multi-national States. To-day there can be hardly any dispute about the fact that Jews form everywhere a "distinctive group." Whether they regard themselves and conversely whether they are regarded as a racial, ethnic-national or religious minority depends mostly on the States and the Jewish communities concerned. Everywhere they are at least "latent minorities—sleeping minorities as one might say—ready to awaken at any moment when their moral union with the rest of the population may be relaxed."¹

The demand put forward on behalf of Jewish collectives aims at the inalienable right *to maintain and foster collectively their ethnic-national, religious and cultural identity, and their protection as a group against any kind of defamation*. These demands are based on a simple and natural human desire, to which also Jews are subject, i.e., to preserve the religion, culture, customs, tradition and specific characteristics of their ancestors and to hand them down to the generations to come. They take into account the realities of the political life in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, where "nationality" being not identical with "citizenship" expresses the adherence to a certain ethnical or racial group, a factor which plays a very important role in questions of language, education, distribution of funds for social and welfare activities, etc. It is self-evident that a great majority of Jews object to any compulsion to declare themselves or to be regarded as members of other ethnical groups and demand, therefore, the opportunity to keep up their own identity.

In 1919 this Jewish problem was approached by the Peace Conference as a part of the big "minorities problem" of Central and Eastern Europe. No attention was paid to the peculiarity and unique position of the Jews in comparison with the German, Hungarian, Polish and other minorities. Thus Jews became usufructuaries of a general system which had to protect minorities as such. It is to be hoped that in future, when the behaviour and attitude of certain minorities in the past will be considered and judged,

¹ M. Politis, representative of Greece at the League of Nations, in the debate about the "Bernheim Case," October 1933—Official Journal League of Nations Suppl. No. 120, 1933.

such judgment will not be generalised, and Jews and Jewish minorities will not be "automatically" included, but judged and dealt with as such.

To-day it seems premature to discuss the various possibilities by which collective rights of certain loyal and reliable groups of citizens may be safeguarded in the future structure of states and of the world organisation as a whole; whether such rights will form a part of a general Bill of Rights of Men or whether again a special system will be suggested. However the settlement of this problem might be approached, one thing seems clear: that a settlement must be found, a settlement which should take into account the peculiarities of the groups concerned and all the experience of the past.

Based on these experiences, Jews will have to demand as the third basic principle, that any regulation of the individual and group rights should be assured by *national and international legislation*. At the same time a machinery will be established that will ensure that the legislation can be successfully applied in everyday practice. Whether it will be a new world organisation, on the lines of the old League of Nations, whether it will be a regional organ or an organ created for this purpose, which will be entrusted in the future with the control of the protection of individual human rights and collective group rights, any such organ can be effective in practice only if it will be equipped with the proper executive power. If such an organ should not be able to enforce its decisions on the States concerned a repeated failure and new disturbances leading to the collapse of the whole peace-organism would be inevitable.

In demanding an *international* supervision of the treatment of collective groups as well as their individual members, one has to agree to the principle that preference should be given—as far as possible—to *national* measures for dealing with complaints and grievances against the State and its administration. Past experience, however, has furnished us with instances where national and international jurisdiction has been very successfully combined. Based, for instance, on an analogy of the Polish-German Convention, which established a Mixed Commission and an Arbitrary Tribunal, one could easily envisage broadly the following organs to be entrusted with the suggested procedure:

(a) *A National Arbitrary Commission*, which would act as the court of first instance, consisting only of nationals, a professional judge as chairman, one arbiter on behalf of the administration and one on behalf of the plaintiff citizens.

(b) *An International Arbitrary Commission* as the court of second instance with a neutral Chairman appointed by the authoritative International Organisation of the United Nations.

(c) *The International Court of Justice* as third and last instance based on lines similar to those of the former Permanent Court of International Justice.

The right of the citizen-individual or of the collective group to take part as plaintiff in the proceedings should be a matter of course. The task and duty to enforce the decisions of the Courts on the state concerned would finally rest with the International Organisation of the United Nations.

It is obvious that such a procedure, which cannot here be elaborated in detail, would involve a certain restriction of the sovereignty rights of the states. But after the experiences of the last three decades it should be clear that the first prerequisite of any future peace-order is inevitably a certain restriction of those sovereignty rights. As any individual in a civilised community has to accept laws and rules governing this community, so also should those who demand an organised and peaceful life between states and nations have recognised by now that they too have to accept certain laws and rules internationally agreed upon. After all, "one of the few positive signs of sovereignty is the right of an independent state to undertake international obligations."¹

One has to agree with Quincy Wright when he says in his excellent paper "Human Rights and the World Order"²: "It is believed that with a carefully drawn bill of human rights and with carefully drawn international legislation limiting the procedure of individual petition to important cases, such national supervision could be dispensed with. The initiation of such a scheme subordinating the sovereignty of states to world law would itself require the development of an effective world public opinion. The United Nations have begun to devote themselves to this task by popularising the conception of human freedom as the objective of all institutions, national as well as international."

Great efforts of world public opinion will be necessary "if the important advance in human freedom to which the United Nations have committed themselves, is to be realised." The extent to which such a realisation would influence the future of the European Continent in general and the position of European Jewry in particular can hardly be exaggerated.

¹ L. P. Mair, *Protection of Minorities*, p. 23.

² *International Conciliation*, No. 389, April 1943, p. 261.

Should and Could the Jews Return to Germany?

By

OTTO LEHMANN-RUSSBUELDT

THE problem whether the Jews should, or could return to Germany fills me with melancholy and sarcasm. Is it to be assumed that, as an "Aryan," I would look at the question differently than as a Jew? It must be made clear that a question of this kind should be regarded from the human point of view irrespective of other considerations. It is, however, just this human approach which significantly reveals the fact that "man" among mankind is the most solitary creature of all. It has always been so. For this, no better proof exists than the word of the Gospel: "Foxes have holes, and birds of the air their nests; but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his head." These often-quoted words are rarely used in their original meaning, whereby the "Son of Man" is a symbol of the simple "man" that Jesus felt himself to be. Jesus, the Jew, went unto death for the sake of the great Jewish prophets' teachings on the child-relationship of all mankind to God.

For two thousand years the saying that man has no abode, not even as the animal, has been repeatedly proved in the case of the Jews. So again to-day. I shall examine the problem in question as does the natural scientist. This is not possible without making personal considerations, but it should be possible to rise to one's moral consciousness in respect to the relationship between human beings.

The problem of the return of the Jews to Germany has both a moral and economic aspect. To-day, by the term "political" is meant the spiritual, the religious, the moral, the universal, and by "economic" is meant the materialistic, the personal, and the practical.

Considered from the political aspect the problem of a settlement of the Jews in Germany has always existed, not only there but also in all other countries. Whether in practice the individual Jew can return will be decided by general political conditions as well as by his personal resolutions and the extenuating circumstances.

* * * * *

Should and Could the Jews Return to Germany?

It was the Jewish philosopher Ben Akiba who realised that everything had already occurred once. He should have added that the eternally-recurring always appears as completely new. This saying finds its confirmation in the latest excesses of Teutonic barbarism against the Jews. Continually the cry of Jews and Gentiles is heard: "Never before has brutality been so universal." Humanly speaking, such a cry is understandable, but it is only the extent of this brutality which is new. The Egyptians, the Assyrians, the Romans, and the Spaniards, in short all other nations have in the past attempted to exterminate the Jews.

But no previous persecution has ever been accompanied with such huge numbers of victims or with such "German thoroughness" of psychological and deadly technique. It is not for the first time in the history of their nation that the Germans have attempted to succeed in this experiment. The visible intensification is not to be found in the motives nor in the recorded results. What appears as intensification is shown only by the general progress of the machine age in all its spheres. No, not all—for in the very realm in which the development of mankind should have been progressive, namely, the moral, the religious and the ethical—a decline has set in, the depth and close of which cannot be foreseen.

As a German I am compelled to state that this modern regression of civilised nations has originated from the Germans, and that its worst symptom is shown by their attitude towards the Jews. Nevertheless, one must try to judge one's own people as other nations, regardless of sentimental, national, or personal bias.

Just as each child, at first, believes itself to be the centre of the universe, all nations wish to be regarded as the wheel on which the threads of history are spun. The only difference lies in character, which is a product of heredity and environment. Whether the national character of the Germans is in itself good or evil—in the social and ethical sense—as it is also in the case of other nations, the fact remains that since the time of the Prussian military monarchy, about two centuries ago, the Germans have entered into an era in which all their actions have attained an ever more frightening aspect to their neighbours. It is, however, true that the same constructive and destructive forces for the development of national life existed with these neighbours. Yet, at a certain point of this development, the tendency of the neighbours was being directed into socially-constructive channels while that of the Germans was straining towards the socially-destructive.

It is one of the more profound and hardly realised causes of

Nazism that after 1918 the heaviest affliction of the last war was not found in the loss of German men, colonies or territory, but in the depravity of the national character, especially that of the coming generation. This corruption found expression in acts of so-called courage against the helpless. With growing concern and deep shame I have, since 1919, watched the desecration of Jewish cemeteries. This was no "solitary case" of brutality or racial hatred as it may be found occasionally recorded in the history of any of the most civilised nations, including that of the Jews. The systematically organised destruction of Jewish cemeteries became a daily occurrence in alarming numbers. What mattered, however, was that nothing was done to prevent it. Yet it would have been a simple task for the large Prussian police force to stop this demolition of inanimate objects. The culprits, of course, committed these desecrations not only because they could be carried out without danger, but because they knew how much they grieved the pious feelings of the Jewish relatives. They were exercises, experiments like those by which German youth was taught to shoot deliberately from aeroplanes and tanks on women and children, as was presently done at Guernica. Sadism became a special weapon of the German war-party, designed to hit the enemy population at its most sensitive and vulnerable spot. Its first targets were the Jewish cemeteries. I have not ceased, since 1919, to draw attention to the danger arising from this particular form of anti-Semitism then already prevalent threatening the newly-created Weimar Republic. This was called "moral trumpeting" or kowtowing to Jewish sentiment. It was in fact only the diagnosis of an unmistakable symptom of a nation whose development had lapsed into degeneration. This special form of German anti-Semitism has its roots in the essential needs of modern aggressive militarism.

* * * * *

A special course of study would be required to ascertain whether the happy mingling of opposite types has not in fact produced the most gifted sections among the communities of mankind, for instance in the case of German Jews and Aryans. I think here not only of sexual relations, but of mutual and spiritual fructification of specific qualities. As far as Germany, and particularly Prussia, is concerned, this does not apply to Jews alone. One can think of the influence which the Huguenots have had on Prussia. Under the Great Elector, three hundred years ago, every third Berlinian was a Frenchman. As a token of gratitude for the granted hospitality,

there even emerged from the French Colony in Berlin a line of capable Prussian military men.¹ The attachment of many a Jew to "Germany" is justified by the same honourable motive.

Lack of space permits only a bald description of the ways in which, during the last century, the socially-constructive tendencies among the German community became associated more with its small Jewish part than with the "Aryan" multitude. How often—long before the first world war—did the Pan-Germans fail to give any answer to the following questions: "The Jews constitute one per cent of the German population; in the medical profession, however, there are about 16 Jewish to every 100 doctors, and 13 Jewish solicitors to every 100. This is explained by saying that the Jews are pressed into these professions. But even in Prussia's higher administrative offices the percentage of Jews is 2.7 per cent (Civil Judges, Librarians, etc.). How is one to explain this? The higher percentage of the Jewish intelligentsia in academic professions cannot be explained by stating that Jews are invited 'by the high-ups' like élite Corps students of Bonn. The exact opposite is true. How is it then that this state of things exists?"

By way of answer, the representatives of Teutonic logic would sometimes take refuge in the materialistic interpretation of history, referring to the large number of Jews in the middle class, and that the intelligentsia is to be found in the middle class. I replied: "This is the theory of the Jew Marx; but it only circumvents the problem without solving it; for why do so many Jews belong to the middle classes?" The embarrassed retort: "The Jews are such unscrupulous money-makers." "Then it would follow that the richest people in Germany and elsewhere are even more unscrupulous money-makers than the Jews, for the wealthiest people are not Jews." There was no further answer to this.

The same confusion of thought prevailed in matters not concerning either money or trade. I recollect a conversation I had, about the year 1900, with a well-meaning but over-enthusiastic Pan-German, an engineer who wrote a book called *Siegfried, not Christ*, and who valued Siegfried more as a benevolent dragon-killer than as an heroic figure of war. Whilst discussing Heinrich Heine, I asked him whether among the poetical literature of his more intimate friends he could name a work written in such beautiful and

¹ It is an equally curious fact that the classical exponent of the art of warfare, the Prussian General von Clausewitz—acclaimed as a true German—in fact had much Polish blood in him; the same applies to one of the greatest masters of the German language, Nietzsche. It is according to the rules of Clausewitz that, at present, the Russians are knocking the Prussians into a cocked hat.

nationally inspired German as Heine's "Harz Reise." He was at least honest enough to fall into an embarrassed silence.

Despite the alleged influence of the "Three Hundred Wise Men of Zion," Ludendorff could not explain how these wise men managed to influence the judges of the Nobel Prize Committee to such an extent that the percentage of Jewish and semi-Jewish Nobel Prize winners for the theoretical and applied sciences, coming from Germany, was about twenty times as high as that of the pure "Aryans." Was this because the Jews bribed the judges or forced themselves into their notice?

How is it possible that a whole nation can be so misled as to base its world policy on such madness as the Germans have done? Here also the key is found in the military sphere, just as the destruction of Jewish cemeteries after 1918 should be considered as prelude to the warfare against women, children and civilians. The small war-party among the Germans has always correctly observed that the Jews constituted relatively by far the most numerous of its opponents at home. Opposition to war is natural to every "human," and for that reason the anti-militarists consisted in particular of democrats, Marxists, sincerely pious men of every denomination, pacifists, and a number of Jews out of all proportion to those of the German Aryans;¹ for the Jews had become as hostile to war, owing to their religion, tradition and 3,000-year-old history of emigration, as the Germans had become friendly towards war, in view of the prosperity gained in three victorious wars from 1864 to 1870.

From all this the small, stark mad war-party in Germany—its strength in its violence—drew the conclusion in 1918 that: "We have lost the war through the fault of the Jews, Marxists and pacifists. Consequently, if we want to win the new war, we must begin by neutralising the Jews, Marxists and pacifists thoroughly and completely. Then we are bound to win the new war from the very first."

This irrefutable logic of madness has been practically applied since the end of 1918, not particularly against Jews, but against all radical opponents of war, therefore against humanitarian demo-

¹ Among the four German prize winners of the Nobel Peace Award, the Jewish proportion was 25 per cent, with a percentage of 1.2 Jews among the German population. Alfred H. Fried, as a Viennese, belonged to the German sphere. He is not a "pacifist" in the sentimental sense of "not being involved in war," but the founder of a scientific pacifism which seeks to replace a rule taking its power from the machine of war by a lawful international order. Without being a Marxist, Fried, in his *Handbuch der Friedensbewegung*, stressed emphatically that such a new world order on the basis of Right is not possible without certain economic structural changes.

crats, socialists and pacifists. Among these the Jews were widely predominant; so the special form of German political anti-Semitism is again apparent, namely, to eliminate completely the comparatively strongest opponent of the war-party at home.

The theory that socially-constructive tendencies in the community life of the German people were stronger within the far smaller Jewish section than within the "Aryan" must not of course be taken to mean that the Jewish section was without its destructive tendencies. Whilst considering Germany's individual form of political anti-Semitism as a particular socially-destructive element, one must keep in mind that during the time in which no "German Reich" existed, but a healthy "German Spirit," no such cultural or racial anti-Semitism prevailed. It was the period determined by the names of Bach, Lessing, Goethe, Herder, Schiller, Kant, the brothers Humboldt. Even with men infused with the Teutonic spirit, such as Arndt, Fichte, and Jahn, the "Father of Gymnastics," anti-Semitism was not a characteristic. Before 1848, in spite of many disabilities of the civic rights of the professing Jew, Jewry exercised a very strong influence as a factor in society, even in Berlin. At the same time, however, a baptized Jew, one Friedrich Julius Stahl, appeared on the scene. Professor of national law, a member of the Upper Chamber, and a member of the Evangelical Church Council, Stahl taught "Authority, not majority." It was Stahl who provided Bismarck with the necessary mental armour against the German democrats of 1848. "Authority, not majority," by the way, has since then become the foundation of all types of dictatorial systems; what is meant is an "authority" backed by the sword and not by the mind.

This particular anti-Semitism in Germany was introduced by the historian Treitschke, who was a prophet of war and an anti-democrat, and who recognised in the Jew a liberal and opponent of war. The Court Chaplain, Stöcker, popularised this anti-Semitism.

Two Jewish personalities, Walther Rathenau and Fritz Haber, are tragic examples of how socially-constructive tendencies can become destructive by an ill-direction of aims.

Rathenau, who as a man was in complete disagreement with war, enabled the German Military High Command, by organising the raw materials needed for war, to last out the war for four years. He did this because he failed to realise the aggressive nature of the war of 1914 and felt himself closely bound to the great and genuine qualities of the Germans. For the German Imperial General Staff was so firmly convinced that they would be able to dictate peace to

France in Paris in September 1914, that it did not occur to them to prepare for a long war.

When, soon after downright defeat on the Marne, a month after the outbreak of the war, only three shells for every German gun were available, it was the chemist, Fritz Haber, who, by extracting nitrogen from the air for the manufacture of explosives, assisted the German High Command to overcome the crisis. Haber was no war enthusiast either; but his invention guaranteed to the enthusiasts and war profiteers an existence for too long a time.

* * * * *

The fact that the tendencies in the German people for the defence of a peaceful community lay mainly with the German Jews, was confirmed in a most striking manner after the outbreak of war in 1939. In the summer of 1940 the inhabitants of the British Isles were threatened by the same danger of annihilation into which all the European nations had been dragged by the existing *furor teutonicus*. It was during the air battle which was raging over Britain on August 20th, 1940, that the following statement was made to Britain and the world from its leading public platform:

"We may be able to do to the enemy quite a lot of things that they have not thought of yet. Since the Germans drove the Jews out and lowered their technical standard, our science is definitely ahead of theirs."

This declaration was made in the House of Commons by Mr. Winston Churchill, called to the service of the State as Prime Minister and organiser of the war in the hour of highest peril. He pronounced this judgment at a time when the German attack had not yet reached its full severity, for this did not occur until the middle of September 1940.

One of the men whom Mr. Churchill may have had in mind is Professor Dr. Georg Schlesinger who, until 1933, was Professor at the Technical High School of Charlottenburg. He specialises in machine-tools. His text-books are standard works in a dozen countries, for the construction of machine-tools. His greatest achievement was the reorganisation of the Russian machine-tool industry which considerably contributed to the surprising success of the Russian war technique. Georg Schlesinger personally conducted this reorganisation, and during a period of ten years made four journeys to the centres of Russia's industry. Now he is working in England.

It must, however, also be emphasised that with these achievements acknowledged by Mr. Churchill, the Jewish immigrants have but fulfilled an obligation. When, during the summer and autumn of 1940, the Royal Air Force defeated the German Luftwaffe four-fold its superior in numbers, it also saved the German immigrants from destruction.

* * * * *

The German form of anti-Semitism is only another proof that it is an extreme form of xenophobia, or dislike of "foreigners," which is common to all nations in some degree.¹

Political anti-Semitism for reasons of a military nature must be difficult to understand, for the great majority of German Jews were not in the least "unpatriotic." The fixed idea of a "Jewish hereditary enemy" probably contains a survival of the ancient conception of sacrifice. Like prisoners of war, the Jews were, in part, used as expiatory offerings to the gods of death after defeat, and in part as thank-offerings in anticipation of desired victories over the enemy.

It needs to be continually and emphatically repeated that the systematic and sadistic extermination of the Jews was carried out not only by the Nazi organisations. These have but represented the executive of the military command, in other words the generals. These sadistic practices might appear harmful from a military point of view because they require time. This is a mistake. They nourished the spirit of "complete victory," a spirit much fostered in the German army.

Against the defenceless it is always easy to gain "complete victories." In addition, the Jews were looked upon as cowards, just as the English were thought to be cowardly and degenerate, because this fitted into the reckoning of "complete victory" to be gained without loss. This calculation has proved to be "completely erroneous" with regard to the Jews as well. The defence of the Warsaw

¹ An "Aryan" émigré friend of mine once made a small experiment in the manner of the "Gallup" Institute in a British Unit of the Pioneer Corps. Having observed the usual sentimental anti-Semitism among many of the men forming this Unit (about 500), he took from the Card Index all cards of Jewish personnel on the one hand and all cards of the men bearing the name of "Smith" on the other. It happened that the two groups were of approximately the same strength. Then he asked a small circle of friends to pass criticism on every man so selected; how he would compare as a soldier, as a worker, and as a comrade. It appeared that the audience—by no means inclined to be philo-Semitic—had to admit that the percentage of men generally regarded as rather poor in these respects was higher among the "Smiths" than among the Jews.

Ghettos will one day be celebrated by history as much as the fight of the Spartans at the pass of Thermopylae is to-day.

The Germans as a nation have, after their classical and romantic periods, produced several personalities who have become of great importance to modern German history and the world in general, be it for good or for evil. I mention among these personalities for example Bismarck, Bebel, Richard Wagner, Ludendorff, Nietzsche, and the Jews Heinrich Heine, Karl Marx, Rosa Luxemburg, Walther Rathenau, and Albert Einstein. All the five Jews were either exiled or murdered as the result of the perverse mentality of the German nation.

When the Third Reich assumed power in the year 1933, the long-planned extermination of the Jews was inaugurated only by slow stages.

First the Jews were to be pillaged. Soon after the "total victory" of the Third Reich in Munich in September 1938, the Nazis organised a systematic pogrom on Armistice Day, November 11th, in order to test the reaction of the German people and the neighbouring nations. As an excuse for the Germans it was at that time commonly circulated that even German officers and soldiers had openly expressed their indignation and disapproval of the pogrom. But to what extent did these German soldiers risk anything? Let it be remembered that since the beginning of 1919 these Germans, in "the honourable uniform of a German officer," had shot down Jews like Rosa Luxemburg, Kurt Eisner, Walther Rathenau and others. No doubt certain self-sacrificing Germans existed who, after 1933, risked and suffered a little for the Jews; but has any German soldier ever shot in the defence of the Jews?

Again, one may argue that other nations did no more to assist the Jews at the time; for example, the British who, on November 11th, 1938, in their churches, after the usual two minutes' Armistice silence only added a minute of prayer for the Jews. Indeed, many Englishmen as well as Jews went so far as to blame the young desperate Jew, Grynspan, for having, on the day before the pogrom, murdered a German Nazi diplomat in Paris. Grynspan was criticised because it was presumed that his action had given rise to the pogrom. It was, however, immediately proved that the Nazis had for weeks prepared this attack on the whole of German Jewry and had for this purpose mobilised their specially instructed marauder bands for the twentieth anniversary of the Armistice. The "German Nation," however, did not rise to counteract these organised bands, nor did the other nations break off diplomatic relations with Ger-

many; in fact they did not even raise official protests of indignation, but continued to provide Germany with all the materials she needed for her coming war. All the Powers acted in this way.

* * * * *

Taking into account the extent of this balance sheet, the problem of the return of the Jews to Germany is moved out of the usual sphere of consideration for anti-Semitism or its opposite. It is moved into the political sphere, which to-day is automatically enlarged into the zone of world-politics. I was most pleased when at a conference of the "Council of Manchester and Salford Jews" in January 1943, a Jewish member of the National Council of Poland, Dr. Schwartzbart, expressed the same view. He said:

"No just and democratic order could be created in Europe without the legal restitution of all the rights of the Jewish people, and there could be no victory of democracy while anti-Semitism was tolerated. I use the term not in the sense that lack of sympathy towards us is a crime. No nation has friends everywhere. It is not a problem of antipathy but of a mass movement aiming at the extermination of our community."

Politics can only be pure if they are in accord with moral principles. Nazism has taken anti-morality as its policy. As a parasitic institution it must not only disappear, but the blood of the German nation, which is the safest harbour of this parasite, must also be purified of these parasitic germs. Until this has been achieved, no exiled Jew can, in my opinion, re-enter Germany. This process of healing will clearly become recognisable when the German nation alone, its spirit of Nazism destroyed, and out of its own moral initiative, invites the Jews to return to Germany.

Such an invitation on the part of a German national government must be the first promise for a possible return. In the same breath let it be added that yet another promise for the Jews must be fulfilled if any general re-immigration is to be thought of. They must be resolved to become citizens or dependents of a nation which, just as any other nation, will be in possession of Roosevelt's "Fifth Freedom"—"Freedom of Soil," as it should be proclaimed. One of my Jewish friends in London, who expressed himself thus, was also able to refer himself to the glad tidings of the dying Faust: "*Auf freiem Grund mit freiem Volke stehn.*" "To stand on Free Soil, with a Free Nation."

The Jews are to-day, as Heinrich Niebuhr said, a nationality

which desires to become a nation again. They are a small people among a larger Semitic group of nations. Much like other small nations, they have for thousands of years been tossed to and fro among the larger nations and their "Empires." They are not the only nation which has, for a long period, lost its national sovereignty. One need only think of the Greeks, the Czechs, the Albanians, and others. There are small peoples similar to the Jews, as the Basques and the Welsh, the Macedonians and the Koreans in East Asia, who are in various stages of dissatisfaction about their legal international status as "nations."

In the case of the Jews it must be added that they are scattered over all the continents, especially Europe, and that in their "homeland," Palestine, under the mandate of the British, even to this day they constitute only one third of the population. In spite of the terrible toll of blood taken by the Germans they still number ten to twelve million souls on the earth; that is as many as three Scandinavian States taken together, or as many as all the Czechoslovaks. As a "Jewish Nation," however, they have not even the area of a large garden of "free soil" under their feet.

Between 1880 and 1907 about 3,000 Jews perished in East European pogroms—a fact which horrified the world. Between 1918 and 1921, in the post-war pogroms of the East, and partly also through epidemics and starvation, 100,000 Jews perished. Between 1939 and 1943 at least three million Jews perished at the hands of the Germans and their satellites—that is up to now. There was much agitation in the rest of the world about this; but even more excitement was caused by the fact that the Jews roundly declared that they would no longer tolerate this state of affairs.

Since the 150 years in which the small nations developed their struggle for freedom from the Turkish Sultan and the Russian Tsar, the great World Powers granted their aid only on condition that the freedom-seeking nations like the Greeks, the Bulgarians, the Serbs, the Czechoslovaks and the others would also fight. This process is again being repeated. One may note how, in the Moscow Declaration of October 30th, 1943, the Foreign Ministers of the U.S.A., Britain and Russia granted to the six millions of Austrians "a free and independent Austria" provided "that in the final settlement account will inevitably be taken of her own contribution to her liberation."

Nothing has been heard of a similar authoritative and solemn declaration towards the so-called Zionists among the Jews. On the contrary! The demand for a Jewish army put forward by the Jews

Should and Could the Jews Return to Germany?

of all countries has been repeatedly rejected by the British Government. Of the 520,000 Palestinian Jews about 136,000 men and women immediately volunteered at the outbreak of war, but only after much obstruction was it possible for Jewish volunteers from Palestine to be incorporated in British regiments.

Those assimilationist Jews, too, who do not desire to or are not able to settle in Palestine, but who, being descendants of a sovereign Jewish nation, are eager to be internationally respected, have demanded a "Free Palestine." I should consider it honourable and an atonement for the German nation if, during the ensuing battles, formations of "Aryan" Germans could be placed alongside Jewish battalions, particularly on ground where the imperative object was to fight the "Nazi."

Testimony exists upon the military achievements of the Jews in the struggle against the Third Reich and its corrupt and deluded denizens—documents which are as genuine as Mr. Winston Churchill's testimony of August 1940. But these testimonies are so little known—and still less quoted—as is also another remark of Churchill's uttered as early as February 1920, by which he promised the Jews "by the borders of the Jordan a Jewish State under the protection of the British Crown in our lifetime," with "three or four millions of Jews."

If a people is to be judged worthy of its freedom according to the extent in which it fights for this freedom, then the Jews have furnished proof of their worth. Here are some details.

When, after the elimination of France in June 1940, the British forces, on land, sea and in the air, were left mainly dependent upon themselves, there existed, next to the task of protecting the British Isles from an invasion, an equally important task, namely that of strengthening the communications to the Near East. In order to carry out these operations at a critical time and in the important Suez Canal, there was required an extraordinary accomplishment of the "Fourth Weapon," the weapon of war industry which, in modern war, has come to be regarded as of equal importance to land, sea and air warfare. This was achieved by the Jews in the Palestine Mandate, first by the development of war production, and then by receiving outstanding Jewish specialists and by the formation of volunteers.

For the purposes of warfare the German chemical industry was very considerably advanced. The balance in favour of the Allies was created by a process of extracting raw materials from the Dead Sea, which the Earl of Lytton, in July 1940, estimated as follows:

"The British Empire, Ceylon, South Africa and Malaya were supplied by the Palestine Mines, taking about 60 per cent of the output."

In 1942, in the House of Commons, the Colonial Under-Secretary, Mr. George Hall, made a statement "that the potentialities of Palestine were much greater than those of other dependencies."

A Dutch "Aryan" writer, Pierre van Paassen (Canada), in a considerable work, *The Forgotten Ally*, has given proof with a wealth of figures and episodes of how Jewish minds and Jewish fighting formations have helped in the conduct of the war of the Allies in the Near East and North Africa. For these achievements the Jews were rewarded by deathly silence. When van Paassen breached this wall of silence he was said to be a "Communist." This is not so; but even if he were, it would still be the same.

The fault for this conspiracy of silence against the Jewish military accomplishments in the struggle with the Germans must be credited alone to the great and the small Allied nations. "Aryan" émigrés from Germany might have been expected all the more to remedy this omission, as Jewish émigrés naturally run the immediate risk of being accused of partiality when they speak *pro domo*.

The discharge of this obligation is a preliminary step to what I consider as an indispensable sincere invitation to the Jews to return to Germany. This invitation should not be withdrawn even if it is as curtly refused as it was by the philosopher and physician, Moses Maimonides, in the 13th century from Cairo, when the Spaniards, after one of their anti-Semitic riots, invited him to return. In the case of the Spaniards only panic and no sincere repentance appears to be evident; for, years later, the nobility of Spain, descendants of the Germanic Westgoths, after the complete defeat of the Moors in Spain, introduced a persecution of the Jews which in ferocity fell little short of Hitler's.

If the Jews could be asked to return to Germany as citizens or representatives of a nation which has once again acquired national sovereignty, such an invitation would be dignified in form and would constitute a token of mutual respect.

After 1933 the Nazis applied pressure to foreign residents in their midst who were a source of discomfort to them; for example, they imprisoned certain foreign journalists; but eventually they very meekly submitted when they received a rap on the knuckles even from one of the smaller nations. One may recall the case of the Jewish author Berthold Jacob who, in 1935, was abducted from Switzerland to Germany because the German militarists had a

particular interest in his person; he was one of the most outstanding experts on the German war machine. As he had been carried off Swiss soil, Switzerland raised a protest which was submitted to by the release of the prisoner. Eight years later, the fugitive Berthold Jacob was surrendered to the Gestapo at Madrid by Portugal.

Another case is that of the Bulgarian Communist, Dimitrov, who during the Reichstag trial in the autumn of 1933 morally defeated the all-powerful Goering before the eyes of the whole world, but was rescued from his murderous claws by the intervention of the Russians.

This submissiveness of the Nazis towards the demands even of smaller nations is not without a parallel which dates from the times of the Jewish persecutions in Spain, 400 years ago. In 1943 Cecil Roth, in *A Short History of the Jewish People*, writes about such surprising submission on the part of these terrorist rulers:

"In the spring of 1497 orders were issued for all Jewish children between 4 and 14 to be presented for baptism on the following Sunday. The children of Moslems who were included in the Edict of Oppression were untouched. The authorities cynically confessed the reason. It was because there were lands in which the Crescent was supreme and reprisals might be carried out." (P. 247-8.)

That was five years after the Spaniards had pursued the last remnants of the Moors out of the country in 1492. The fear that reprisals might be taken by the powerful Mohammedan countries prevented them from carrying out the intended compulsory baptism of the Mohammedan children which they had inflicted upon the Jewish children.

At the present time the Germans have not been threatened with reprisals on behalf of the Jews; but whenever they were met by a firm attitude they were quick of hearing and anxious to listen. During the spring of 1942 the Germans in the Crimea made slow military progress against the Russians and threatened to use poison gas. Mr. Winston Churchill, in the House of Commons, before the whole world, informed the German army command that if such a case should arise the British themselves would immediately use poison gas. The gas attack against Russia did not materialise.

Even the lesser nations are amenable to firm action. In the year 1943 German pressure in the Argentine was instrumental in the enforced prohibition of several Jewish papers of old standing; but a plain hint from Washington was sufficient to procure the lifting of the ban within twenty-four hours.

* * * * *

The problem under consideration as to whether the individual Jew can or shall return to Germany, quite apart from its practical and personal nature, appears primarily as a problem of human dignity; it amounts to whether not only Jews but any human beings, that is even "different Germans," will be at liberty in Germany to live at least a decent normal life.

In all probability two alternatives will arise for the Jews: either the German army will collapse before its opponents have entered Germany, or the German army, during its retreat, will fight for every village to the last building as is now happening in Italy. In either case the fate of the Jews still left in Germany and the satellite states can only be one of annihilation. To be forced to tolerate these continued anti-Semitic excesses, however, is bound to have an ill-effect upon many Germans who are morally averse to these actions. They will feel uncomfortable about neighbours who by their very existence give cause to such a mad orgy, and all the Jews, to them, will be tainted, undesirable elements.

Although the question will arise for every nation alike as to whether they will be ready again to be on friendly terms with Germany, this question is most pressing for Jewry, which has become the marked victim of the German barbaric instincts. In the Moscow Declaration of 30th October, 1943, newly devised atrocities of the "Hitlerite Huns," during their retreat in the Ukraine, are powerfully emphasized. The special responsibility for the "redoubled cruelties also on French and Italian soil" is laid, in the first place, at the feet of German officers and soldiers, and only in the second place to "members of the Nazi party." There is no mention in the Moscow Declaration that the Jews, whenever German officers and soldiers were able to catch hold of them, have been the special object of the "redoubled cruelties" committed by them against all the nations under their heel.

It is necessary, therefore, first of all to answer the general question whether "another Germany" exists into which the Jew as an individual can return. No Jew, indeed no human being to-day, could possibly take up a political mortgage on the hopes and promises of "another Germany" made by some German émigrés and non-German humanitarians abroad. Let me add with equal frankness, that I do not, on the other hand, consider the rise of that other Germany to be impossible. Why should a creative period of social and human reconstruction not arise in the German people too? All nations, the Jews included, have gone through periods of rise and decline. The dawn of Germany's new humanity would mani-

Should and Could the Jews Return to Germany?

fest itself in her spontaneously given unconditional invitation to her exiled Jews to return home as esteemed and valuable citizens.

This includes the question frequently asked whether there will be material compensation for the injured Jews. When the Jews are invited to return to the new Germany an added statement should be made that compensation for damage will be granted even if a curt refusal to Germany's invitation is made on the part of Jewry as a whole or individually. It is, however, true that the settlement of claims for compensation will not depend on any German Government as, for the time being, the Germans will be subject to international regulations. The way, however, in which "the different Germany" would express her willingness to grant material compensation, particularly to the Jews, would show whether this readiness was spontaneous and sincere, or whether it was calculated; whether the spirit of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing prevailed or that of the hidden ghost of Stöcker, the Court Chaplain, who under William II paved the way for the indigenous anti-Semitism "Made in Germany."

The question of material compensation and the official reinstatement into public offices or functions of the Jews will become a question of policy not only for Germany. It leads us once again to observe that the Jews are homeless in all countries, under a yoke of general ill-favour, and with the reputation of being sharp traders. But it is not only Jews alone who, in wartime, are profiteers and blackguards, or in peacetime thrive on capitalistic exploitation. When incidents of that kind about Jews are reported in the papers, critical comment is fixed not, as it ought to be, on the methods of illegal exploitation or of Capitalism itself, but on one specially selected scapegoat.

These accusations would assume a different aspect and result in different forms of treatment in the international sphere, if Jewry with its ten million souls could but rely on the support of a sovereign nation as do nations or nationalities far smaller in number than they. When, however, the Jews, in their hour of supreme affliction, desired representation of their national rights, neither in Bermuda nor in Moscow at the Conference of the Three Ministers nor at Atlantic City (UNRRA) were they thought worthy in their particular need of the respect to which they are entitled. One may draw a comparison with the special treatment which another small nation received: Austria.

* * * * *

I have been asked whether in the post-war Germany of the future an aversion might not prevail against the Jews which would affect even men of my own way of thinking, and which would make me shrink from contact with Jews so that I should not desire their return or re-immigration.

In answer to this question, I would draw attention to the attitude of two Eastern Jews. They were not citizens of the Reich and, therefore, could not be "returners"; but their personalities might have been of the greatest value to the spiritual rebirth of Germany—were they still alive. I am speaking of two Jews who, out of grief for the suffering of mankind, took their own lives.

The journalist, Lux, from Prague, on 3rd July, 1936, publicly shot himself in the League of Nations Assembly so as to ensure that a letter left by him would fall into the hands of the British Foreign Minister, Eden. In this letter Lux theorised that in his opinion Anthony Eden was the only man in the world who might prevent the catastrophe threatening from Germany.

The second case is that of the Polish Jewish deputy, Zygmunt Zygielbojm, who, overwhelmed by grief about the misdeeds against the Polish Jews by hundreds of thousands of German soldiers, took his life. Through his Prime Minister, Sikorski, he also addressed a farewell letter to his Polish people, to the Allies, and "to the conscience of the world." In vain, wrote Zygielbojm, had he waited for a sign of protest from the *German* side against the foul deeds of German soldiers. The reception of the Jews in Germany in the humanitarian spirit of Lux and Zygielbojm would be more than a protest.

There are cases where older Jews who were able to lead a happy life in Germany through their memories still cherish a true love for German soil. Such cases are becoming rarer. In any case they are too few in number to be of sociological importance.

More numerous are the cases of Jews—now exiled from Germany, or whose ancestors were banished or who are not German Jews—who cannot await the time when the German frontiers will be re-opened again. They have various personal accounts to settle with accomplished German scoundrels for themselves and for murdered relations.

But among the German Jewish émigrés there still exist men with the spirit of Lux and Zygielbojm. Occasionally a special affinity exists between "national" opposites. If I, as a German and world citizen, consider the morally productive influence which the Jews have exercised in the Alexandria of Imperial Roman times, or

later in Spain, in Holland, and most conspicuously in Germany itself, I could only congratulate the Germans if "returners" of such quality and other Jewish missionaries of world citizenship were to find their way back to Germany.

* * * * *

To sum up: the problem under consideration should be treated with a twofold purpose: to deal on the one hand with the exiled German Jewry and the Jews as a whole, and on the other with special individual cases. In both cases I maintain that intuition, wisdom and above all self-esteem and dignity, must forbid the Jews to consider the possibility of return before they are certain that "another Germany" will really be in existence. The existence of such a Germany, where one may live as a human being and as a citizen, cannot be realised by protestations and promises, but only by facts and deeds clearly representing the reverse of the German spirit as it is in existence now.

A preliminary deed for the establishment of a new Germany would be made visible to the Jews by the sincerity of the invitation sent out to the exiled Jews and other Jews as a whole. The moral obligation for material compensation to the victims exists independently of the extent to which such an obligation might legally and internationally be imposed, and whether the Jews will accept the appropriate invitation to return. A further proof that the change of heart in Germany is genuine would be made recognisable by the degree of energy and success with which Germans would fight at the side of the Jews in order to obtain for them that which all nations regard as the essential foundation of their freedom, namely, their Free National Land. On the ground of such testimonies and achievements, the necessary decision whether they *can* lies with the Jews alone.

But *should* they go? As a German and world citizen, I should welcome it if the Jews, as of old, would place their intrinsically creative and socially productive gifts at the disposal of Germany.

Should and Could We Return to Germany?

By

A REFUGEE

THERE are many people, Jews and non-Jews, who grow indignant at the mere idea of any future German-Jewish reconciliation. They strongly censure all those who advocate any measures to facilitate the return of Jewish refugees to post-war Germany whatsoever her political and spiritual condition will be. From a number of points of view it may be questioned whether the problem as such actually exists. But once its existence is assumed, it must be examined without emotion, difficult though this may appear in view of the countless crimes committed against Jews in the name of the German nation. It has been strongly claimed, and also strongly denied, that a large section of the German people has condemned those atrocities as severely as any British, American, or Russian citizens have done. Until many more facts relating to conditions inside Germany during the past four years are known, it is not possible to determine which point of view is correct. But there are still some among the refugees who remember the active help and support given to them by anti-Nazis inside Germany, at a time when such assistance implied the risk of heavy punishment and of a black record with the Nazi police. Whether or not all those brave men and women inside Germany are still alive, with their spirits unbroken by Hitler terror, we cannot even guess. The absence of any large-scale insurrection against Hitler proves as little as the absence of mass desertions in the German army.

I

New hopes are soaring for a better world to come after the final defeat of the evil forces. The countries so long oppressed by the Nazi power are beginning to regain their freedom. Even the people of the aggressor nations can look forward to the armistice and the ensuing period as to days of convalescence from a grave and terrible illness, from error and hallucination. However deservedly harsh their fate, it will be that of a community, a collective fate, to be shared by millions of fellow-countrymen whose main

purpose in life, whatever their differences of opinion, will have to be voluntarily or forcibly directed towards reconstruction, rebuilding and re-birth.

The Jews at this juncture are apt to see themselves alone. They seldom feature in the picture as drafted by the planners of the post-war world. They have chosen the right side in the struggle, and have paid for it a colossal price: the millions of European Jews slain or gassed by the Nazis constitute a much higher proportion of casualties than any of the belligerent nations, victors or vanquished, have to mourn. Those amongst the Jews who have been lucky enough to escape the hangmen or to live outside their reach, have contributed their share to the common war effort as willingly and valiantly as any other section of civilised mankind. They have served as combatants, war-workers, doctors, nurses, clerks—indeed wherever they were admitted. Many an Allied spokesman has repeated time and again the words of General Smuts, that after the war it should be remembered that whoever else faltered, the Jews did not.

But in spite of official praise of their loyalty to the cause of the Allied Nations, the expression of sympathy for those bereaved and the threat of heavy punishment awaiting the criminals, the majority of Jewish refugees from Nazi oppression are still sceptical and uneasy about their future and that of their children. They are continually wondering: "What is to become of us? Where are we going to live? How? And who is going to look after us, in a world which, after all that has happened, will consider national states as the only units to be dealt with at international conference tables?"

A small minority of Jewish emigrants, very small indeed, have striven hard, and are still striving, to rid themselves of all desires and hopes about a specified country in which they would be esteemed and protected, politically and socially, as citizens. "Why not make the best of a state of affairs," they say, "which after all is the result of a two-thousand-years-old process? Why not adapt our souls, our habits, our general attitude towards life to the idea that we refugees are possibly meant to be the forerunners of an entirely new type of man? National States with their rigid boundaries, political communities with their inherent prejudices and discriminations have become suspect and are now denounced as watertight compartments in which the human mind must become short of breath, lose its elasticity and decay." "Man cannot live but as a member of a community?" "Yes, we know that and agree

with that axiom. But we venture to define the term 'community' in our own way. Is a community only something that has been set up by a written constitution, a covenant, a local council? In an epoch when an aeroplane takes you round the globe in less than thirty hours, some men and women may be entitled to look upon mankind without applying any discrimination, national or continental, religious or racial. They may feel at home wherever their work is wanted, wherever they can make themselves useful, wherever they are likely to meet a few fellow-workers to co-operate with them, to appreciate their set of values and to enjoy common relaxation. When the work is done, there may be other places to make a fresh start, maybe just round the corner, maybe in the neighbouring district or country, maybe thousands of miles away across the ocean. Man is not born to have a fixed abode. He who has wings does not need roots. And it may very well be that, in a world still consisting of so many established and recognised collective units, a few hundreds or thousands of individuals have been appointed by Providence to wander homelessly over the earth as so many messengers of goodwill and humanism in its original sense. Whether this destination, if it exists, is to be interpreted as a curse or as a blessing for those who have to obey it, will largely depend on their fortitude and sincerity."

So they argue while preparing themselves for a life of adventure, strain and experiment from which there will be no guaranteed return to any place of safety or peacefulness; no "old country" will welcome them home, no government or municipal board will honour them by appointments. Their only home will be in the hearts of their friends, and their only security will be their confidence that they serve the right cause, the progress of Man. They are, as was said above, a very small vanguard, those Jewish scientists, doctors, authors, poets, industrial workers and tradesmen, who are determined to renounce henceforth the guarantees to be given to them by peace treaties and other international instruments, and to remain "foreigners" for the rest of their life. It remains to be seen whether they will live up to their purpose, without being discouraged by failure or new persecution. If they succeed, mankind will have to salute them some day as a group of brave and experienced pioneers. But the future of Jewry will not be settled nor even be influenced by those exceptional men.

II

In contrast to this courageous minority who are not anxious to acquire any citizenship at all, are all those among the refugees who regard it as the most important thing for themselves to be accepted as citizens of the country which has given them sanctuary from Nazi oppression. It has been said by people who are supposed to know, that whereas England uses the term "emigrants," the United States of America speak of "immigrants." However that may be, the great majority of Jewish refugees who have reached America regard themselves as prospective American citizens and have no wish or substantial reason, as far as can be seen, to re-emigrate, let alone return to Germany or Austria. A similar state of comparative satisfaction with their political status probably exists amongst those who are at present prospective or even *de facto* citizens of some South American states or of Sweden, Turkey, Portugal. As far as Palestine is concerned, it would appear almost paradoxical to anticipate that Jews who have been lucky enough to be admitted to the "National Home" and to find recognition as Palestinian citizens should ever dream of voluntarily changing their present nationality, however hard and unstable conditions may be there at present, owing to the state of uneasiness and distrust resulting from the "White Paper" policy. But even supposing that this policy be reversed and the Jews residing in Palestine are acknowledged as citizens of their own country and not as guests of the Arabs or of the British, it seems highly improbable that, for many years to come, Palestine will be able to absorb all those Jewish refugees or even a majority of them who have not become citizens of American states or of the Soviet Union.

Thus the question arises how far Jews who have escaped from Nazism into England and other parts of the British Empire can wish or hope to be assimilated and granted British citizenship. How this question has to be answered will depend not exclusively on the attitude of the British Government, but to some extent also on that of the refugees themselves. If there is any section of Jewish refugees who consider the possibility of a return to their former countries, they are chiefly to be found among those living in Great Britain.

Statistics show that the number of Jewish refugees from Germany and Austria living in the United Kingdom totals forty odd thousand. Many of them are elderly people who have no other

A Refugee

wish than to spend the rest of their lives in an atmosphere of comparative peace, free from persecution and protected by the law of a democratic commonwealth, which requires not much more from its guests than that they abide by its regulations. Whether or not these quiet and unambitious people become naturalised, whether they will become capable of earning their livings by themselves, or whether they will be supported by charitable institutions, problems of this kind should cause no difficulties for Great Britain. For the British can be trusted to fulfil the demands of charity as conscientiously as is possible under present-day circumstances.

But the problem of the Jewish refugees is not in the first place one of charity. Its political aspect becomes evident as soon as the question is asked: Do the British people, in general, contemplate it as an asset or as a liability to have tens of thousands of people coming from Continental countries in their midst? Moreover, what would they prefer: to see them equipped with British passports and enjoying full citizenship, or that they should re-emigrate, provided they are not exposed to new atrocities and indignities? In spite of the assurances given by benevolent British statesmen, Churchmen and writers, a great many among the refugees, if not the majority, are firmly convinced that a section of the British, in particular those belonging to the middle classes, would welcome their re-emigration as soon as the war is over. It would be futile to start an investigation of the various reasons for this attitude. Xenophobia, softened by active charity, was a characteristic of a fairly considerable section of public life in Britain long before the present problems were dreamt of. The alleged deeply rooted differences between the British and the "continental" mode of life and the mentality resulting from it, are reduced, if closely examined, to as many varieties of thought as the unevenness of social, economic and political development is bound to produce anywhere. The alleged existence of a *uniform* British mentality permeating all walks of life and transgressing all barriers of classes is as much of a myth as the existence of a *uniform* "continental" mentality.

It may very well be that the prejudice against anti-Nazi refugees, those first surviving victims of Nazi beastliness, is due to the general state of nervousness resulting from the war. But it must not be forgotten that those prejudices and, in general, a scarcely concealed antipathy against refugees, for which some of the refugees themselves were partly to blame, made itself felt long before the outbreak of war. The question was often asked whether the men and women expelled from Germany and Austria had not been guilty

of arousing by their own misbehaviour the fury of the Nazis, then the officially acknowledged rulers of Germany.

Apart from Colonel Blimp and his followers, even British Jews have not been, nor are, altogether free of a certain antipathy towards their co-religionists from Germany and Austria. Much though they have done to facilitate their escape from concentration camps and to protect them from physical starvation once they had landed on British soil, they do not show much inclination to accept them in their ranks socially, or to give them actual opportunities for building up a new existence according to their abilities. Of course there have been most praiseworthy exceptions, but generally speaking it can be maintained that of the lasting friendly contacts made between Jewish refugees and British subjects, the vast majority has been established by non-Jews. Jewish scientists, scholars, authors and artists in particular can provide ample evidence to this effect.

The feeling of being not too well liked by a considerable section of the British people and in particular by British Jews, in spite of friendly reception by other sections, could not fail to make many of the Jewish refugees anxious to look out for an alternative opportunity of continuing life after the war. Those, of course, who, in spite of the difficulties mentioned above, have already succeeded in establishing their existence on British soil as manufacturers, traders, experts of any kind, have every reason to hope for their final amalgamation with their British counterparts, Jews or non-Jews. But their type, small in number, can be disregarded when the problem of the refugees is being examined. They have practically ceased to be emigrants, they have become Britons, and the question of their status will doubtless be settled before long, if it has not been settled already. The same may prove to be the case with a great part of those who were still children when their parents succeeded in getting them out of Germany into this country and sending them to British schools. Many, although not all, of these young people have been brought up in English surroundings; they speak English without an accent, and the Germany of pre-Hitler days is, to them, little more than a beautiful legend, too attractive to be believed. It can be hoped that they will be considered as having been sufficiently "anglicised" to be accepted as British subjects without any discrimination.

Seen from this angle, the remaining sections of Jewish refugees living in Britain at present and not very likely to remain here after the war, can be subdivided under four different headings: (1) those who have been granted *visas* or other facilities to land in America,

A Refugee

Palestine or other countries overseas and who are waiting for the end of the war to book their passage; their individual problems will have to be solved by their respective countries of adoption. (2) A certain number of people whose experiences on British soil make them look back to the conditions under which they used to live in Germany or Austria in the pre-Hitler days, in a manner not unlike that of the followers of Moses when the tribulations of their long wandering made them look back to the flesh-pots of Egypt; there are not only craftsmen and shopkeepers among this section to whom the little shop they once owned in Berlin, Leipzig or Vienna has meant a pleasant and useful reality as compared with hundreds of vague hopes and illusions which have failed to materialise during the years of exile; there are also doctors among them who are sick of serving as waiters or night porters and wish to resume their original profession as soon as possible under whatever conditions; there are scientists, teachers and technicians who are under no delusion that, when the war is over, their wartime appointments will come to an abrupt end and they are most likely to swell the number of the unemployed, whereas they could make themselves useful in the country of their birth, regardless of whatever horrible events have taken place there ever since they had to leave. (3) The functionaries of Trade Unions and other political bodies to whom, more or less, political activity has been and still is the main interest of their life and the mere idea of permanent inactivity is almost tantamount to being condemned to life-long imprisonment. These men see the most important task of their entire existence not in the past, but in days to come, when, as they think, they will be needed to help build up the new Germany. (4) Refugees who, owing to their particular profession, are debarred of almost any hope of ever winning a real foothold in this country: all those who are dependent on the German language, such as authors and actors who are well aware that, once their temporary jobs as B.B.C. announcers or in war plays come to an end, they will have little opportunity, if any, of earning their daily bread in this country.

It is certainly true that the total number of individuals falling under these headings is not very high. Let us assume that not more than a few thousand refugees wish to return to Germany if conditions permit. Is so small a percentage of European mankind worth much consideration? Can it create a real problem? Yet such an attitude could not be reconciled with the widely acknowledged doctrine that minorities, however small in number, should receive proper attention. Moreover, the very problem reflects, when closely

examined, a problem of post-war Germany itself—perhaps one of its most crucial problems. As such, it is a problem of great significance for the Allies.

III

Before examining this problem and drawing certain conclusions, it is perhaps advisable to determine what parties, if any, could benefit from a solution which would allow the Jews to return to Germany or Austria and to live there under satisfactory conditions. The parties from whose particular points of view the problem must be examined are the Allies, the Jews themselves and, of course, the Germans.

To start with the Germans. There is every reason to anticipate that, however leniently and magnanimously the victors will decide upon the fate of post-Nazi Germany, she will be regarded, for some time to come, by all her neighbours with antipathy, suspicion, even hatred and contempt. Czechs, Poles, Danes, Dutch, Frenchmen and the rest cannot be expected to examine objectively the general conditions, both economic and political, which caused the failure of the Weimar Republic, the fatal rift within the democratic front and the final victory of the Big Three who represent German barbarism: the Generals, the Junkers and the Captains of heavy industry. Whatever the various causes, the ascent of Hitler and his gang and the unspeakable crimes perpetrated by them in the name of the German nation have created an entirely new situation which cannot be regarded as a mere continuation or result of a development which had begun in the Hohenzollern era: it has established new historical facts, which have been accepted by the German nation as a whole. They cannot be reversed by a simple change of regime and the disowning of the Nazi party, but only by the creation of an appropriate set of different facts. Such a new situation must make it clear beyond any doubt that the Germans as a nation have wholeheartedly embraced the demands of humanitarianism and charity and immunised themselves from the poison of militarism and brutal arrogance. The question as to what kind of facts will be regarded as satisfactory evidence that a change of heart has actually taken place, will hardly be answered by the enemies of Germany. For any answer but the most evasive and vague would saddle them with a moral and political responsibility which they do not feel obliged to accept.

The desire for revenge and for full-scale punishment must also be taken into account. The result may well be that for the period

A Refugee

immediately following the armistice, Germany may be almost isolated from the rest of Europe. It may not be possible for foreigners to visit Germany except by special permission and under direct protection of the Army of Occupation. Foreign business men, industrialists and merchants who will have to trade with German authorities or individual firms, will take special precaution and behave as they might do if visiting Central Africa, Borneo or the Punjab. For a time there may be little intercourse with the new Germany, and her isolation from the other nations will make itself felt, not only in the social and cultural spheres of life, but also and foremost on its economic side. When and by what means German economic and industrial life will become anything like normalised, will depend on many factors, one of which will be the general trend of economic and sociological development in the post-war world. To say more at the present moment would be mere guesswork. But it can be assumed that Germany will have to accept close supervision, if not detailed regulation of her economic life, from abroad. This being so, German citizens of goodwill who will be anxious not to prepare for a third World War, but to restore their country to a normal relationship with the other nations, will be searching for channels through which the message of their changed attitude towards life and the truth about the facts inside the new Germany may reach the outer world. The impressions gained by the Armies of Occupation, and by the administrative bodies to be set up by the Allies, could be confirmed by individuals of non-official character whose integrity and impartiality are beyond doubt.

It is here that the refugees can play a part which can be of the utmost importance for the Germans. Those who will have taken it upon themselves to live side by side with Germans after the war can be trusted to form an objective judgement and not to let themselves be taken in by any tricks or bribes offered to them by Nazis in disguise or other representatives of the evil forces that have ruined Germany. Refugees who have learnt their lesson and are willing to make use of their knowledge not only for their own benefit but also for that of the world, including Germany, will be very sensitive to any breeze, however slight, that blows from the quarter that is cursed. They must not repeat the old mistake of shrugging their shoulders, declaring their disinterestedness in political matters and continuing their daily work as if all were well. On the other hand, they are likely to pay full tribute to all actions and manifestations of goodwill, charity, sincerity and true friendship which they may experience in the new Germany. And they

will be ready and able to communicate such experiences to their friends and acquaintances abroad, at the same time informing the Germans of the actual conditions of life, the ideas and sentiments, likes and dislikes prevailing in the countries where they had been given hospitality before their return. If the Germans, after the war, are seriously interested to make their final conversion to the humanitarian and charitable life known to other nations, they may look upon the few thousand Jews in their midst as so many unpaid, but highly efficient propagandists.

Obvious as the interest of a new Germany in German-Jewish co-operation and mutual goodwill appears, there is even less doubt that any such understanding would have to be welcomed by the Allies.

In the first place it would ease their task of finding appropriate homes and occupations for at least a section of those refugees who have found no such home during their exile and will not be allowed to settle in Palestine. Moreover, refugees may prove of great value to the Allies if they can overcome the initial obstacles and create a soothing and stabilising influence among the German people, in whom an almost inevitable state of mental depression and despondency might easily turn into one of despair and wholesale fear of all foreigners. Such a state of mind might well become a fertile soil for the seeds of Chauvinism and militant Teutonism, if not sensibly looked after in time. This task cannot be fulfilled by English and American preachers, school-teachers and writers of popular pamphlets alone, and most certainly not by the occupying armies and the administrative bodies attached to them.

Julius Cæsar is quoted by Mommsen in his *Roman History* as having stated that, wherever in the framework of the Roman Empire nationalistic or separatistic tendencies threatened to endanger the peace and to lead to insurrection, Jewish envoys, scholars and civil servants could be relied upon to oppose the most radical elements and to persuade the people to resort to political methods rather than to violence and to bloodshed. The history of the Jews had made them very much alive to the ideas of universalism and extremely suspicious of militant nationalism. What was true nearly two thousand years ago may be even more so now.

Jews serving in the Armies of Occupation or in the Civil Administration should be regarded and employed like any other British, American or Russian citizens serving their Governments. Moreover, some clear distinction should be made between them and

those Jews who wish to make the new Germany or Austria their home and to live and co-operate with its inhabitants. The Germans, after their experiences with Himmler's Secret Police and its many thousands of spies and *agents provocateurs*, are likely to remain for some time in mortal fear of all secret services. They will regard Jews employed by them as their revengeful foes rather than their friends. Such distrust of German Jews serving the Allies in the post-war period might easily reflect upon their general attitude towards Jews and destroy a future understanding even before it is actually cemented.

Assuming that German-Jewish co-operation, if it could be established, would serve the interests of the Germans as well as of the Allies, it remains to be examined whether or not it would benefit the Jews. If not, then further discussion is unavailing.

From what point of view is the term "the Jews" to be understood in this particular context? It must not be forgotten that it has been only through Nazism and its crimes that some community of fate has been created among millions of individuals who, prior to this period, had not much, if anything, in common: neither language, religion, profession, nor citizenship. It would be folly to assume that with the disappearance of militant anti-Semitism there would exist anything like unity, let alone unanimity, among those people whom Hitler has called "the Jews." Among them are many thousands of men and women who were brought up in the Christian faith, and often did not know that their grandfather or grandmother was of Jewish origin. There are also the hundreds of thousands of those who, although born of Jewish parents and who officially continue to profess the Jewish faith, feel no common bond of practical interest or principle between themselves and other Jews. As late as the spring of 1940 when the Nazi armies were already massing for their final assault against France, Belgium and Holland, a well-known British Zionist visited France and attempted to collect some funds among wealthy Jews in Paris. It seemed to be more than likely, then, that preparations would be made to facilitate the escape of many more thousands of European Jews from Hitler's hangmen and torturers. Several of those French Jews showed little, if any, interest in the fate awaiting their co-religionists. They justified their lack of sympathy by the argument that they were first and foremost Frenchmen, and that it was the future of France with which they were concerned. Ultimately, of course, they were considered by the Nazis and also by the French Fascists as Jews.

This episode is not mentioned in this context to cast blame on the attitude of Jewish citizens who feel as much loyalty and practise as much patriotism towards the country in which they live and work and enjoy all the privileges of citizenship, as the most patriotic of Gentiles. But, in considering the general interests of "the Jews," it should be remembered that even the term itself is objected to by large sections of those one has in mind in discussing the problem. Even in Great Britain and, most probably, in the United States of America, many members of the Jewish community feel extremely uneasy at the public discussion of any such questions and regard it as the safest course to ignore anti-Semitism, to abstain from any counter-move and to hope that it may die down by itself.

A very similar attitude has been prevalent amongst German Jews. When, in 1919, Clemenceau offered their representatives the international protection as established by a certain clause of the peace treaties for all national minorities within a country, they rejected the offer and declared themselves as one hundred per cent German citizens who wished to be treated in every respect like their non-Jewish co-nationals. The Jews in Germany, France and Italy never dreamt of the horrors of persecution, and the confidence which they showed towards their co-nationals originated from a state of mind not entirely different from that of Jewish Soviet citizens. That in the case of the Soviet Union a revival of anti-Semitism appears as unlikely as the return of Czarism, whereas in the non-Socialist countries general social conditions were not sufficiently stabilised to guarantee the continuity of sound and satisfactory human relations, may cast some doubt on the political far-sightedness of German, French and Italian Jews. But it could not alter that strong impulse existing within Jewry to place the cause of the country of which they are citizens above the common cause of the Jews. It is only the comparatively small section of Jewry, living in Palestine, that has been lucky enough to be freed of that conflict which was born together with the emancipation of the Jews at the dawn of the nineteenth century. To Palestinian Jews, and to their Zionist brethren abroad, the cause of their country, the "National Home," and the cause of Jewry at large have become the very same thing. In comparison all such special questions as the desirability of future good relations between Germans and Jews are of secondary importance.

In view of all these facts and complexities one has to come to the somewhat disheartening conclusion that the question whether the return of refugees to Germany and Austria would be in the

A Refugee

interests of the Jews, cannot be answered by a general statement, except perhaps by the almost commonplace remark that reconciliation and the establishment of relations of goodwill where there has been persecution and massacre would have to be welcomed by all sensible people in the world, whether Jewish or Christian or Mohammedan.

In the circumstances therefore, as far as the Jews are concerned, the problem must be examined as that of the small minority which has been characterised above: refugees who cannot hope to obtain *visas* for Palestine or the United States of America, and who do not wish to remain in Great Britain; in addition there are also those few who have some personal reason to hope for the recovery of their former business contacts in Germany, or, because of their profession, are more or less dependent on the German language. The question whether return, if possible, would be in their interest, is largely answered by themselves, namely by their definite wish for such an opportunity. Not a few among them, and certainly the younger ones, are filled with a spirit that could justly be compared to that of missionaries or cultural pioneers. They are most anxious to have a hand in the work of political, economic and cultural reconstruction, with complete disregard for the perils and indignities such participation may entail for them. They are not likely to be deterred from their purpose by any warnings or pessimistic forecasts. If they can succeed, they will have achieved a most considerable piece of work, and everybody who wishes for a humanitarian era will have to salute them. Jews all over the world will, however reluctantly, have to acknowledge that those of their co-religionists who helped a better Germany into existence are doing more for the progress of human society than those who advocate the breaking up of the German nation into several statelets or of the reducing of Germany to a colonial status for a century to come.

IV

If, then, the return of such Jewish refugees to Germany and Austria and their constructive co-operation with Germans and Austrians would appear desirable from every point of view—from that of the Germans as well as from that of the Allies and also from that of the Jews concerned—two further questions now have to be examined: (1) Will such a return be possible, and if so, how? (2) What guarantees and facilities are to be provided in order to make it a speedy success?

This is not the place to forecast the conditions of life that may be expected in Germany after the war. Suffice it to say that the material devastation may prove to have been even greater than is now realised and that the general condition of the people's morale may present problems hitherto not yet met with within human experience. All this must be taken into account by any Jewish refugee intending to return to Germany. It will need tremendous efforts, much patience, thoughtfulness and profound human understanding to dispel the atmosphere of despondency and suspicion. The refugees, Jewish and non-Jewish, will be considered by many as deserters, if not as mortal enemies who have contributed to the devastating victory of the Allies, which, after the final liquidation of Nazism, may present itself as a victory over the German people as a whole. All promises held out to a democratised Germany of the future will meet with scepticism and widespread distrust. Popular pamphlets explaining the general advantages of democracy and international co-operation will help little. Nor will scores of public lectures, sermons and editorials. A considerable part may be played by members of the Society of Friends, whose charitable activities are well remembered in many places of Germany. But it is exactly at this most critical juncture that the refugees may be able to help decisively, *if they can overcome the initial obstacles*. They speak the language of the people, they have borne the first brunt of Nazism, they have been breathing the fresh air of a democratic country, and yet they have willingly returned to Germany because they still believe in the great potentialities existing in the souls of the German people which Nazism was able to suppress, but not to kill. Refugee doctors and lawyers, authors and actors, teachers, scientists, engineers and industrial workers may largely contribute to resuscitating in many Germans the memory of the martyrs and champions of human progress in German history. They can help to awake a new kind of national pride which is based on the recollection that, while so many Germans have been largely responsible for world-wide sufferings and destruction, there have been other German nationals who have achieved great things to the benefit of mankind.

It is in their name that the young generation must be brought up. For this young generation, including all those who were in their teens when Hitler seized power, cannot be held responsible for the bestialities committed by the Nazis. They will have to be taught that man is not born to die, but first and foremost to live, and that death is but a normal and ultimate occurrence of life, necessitated

A Refugee

by the general planning of nature. German youth has to learn that other nationals, too, are ready to die for their country or for the cause in which they believe, but that they understand it as a supreme sacrifice, not as the normal thing to face and certainly not as the real meaning of man's existence. The danger of the German infatuation with death cannot be over-emphasised. For people who are in constant readiness to throw their life away like a worn-out shoe cannot be expected to show much concern for the life of their neighbour. The Germans must be taught to appreciate life itself as precious; they must be freed of their suicidal complexes which so easily turn into murderous complexes.

But to fall in love with life will not easily happen for anyone who has to struggle against hunger, cold, contempt and compulsion. Jewish refugees, with their traditional respect for human life, will not succeed in converting Germans to a new conception of the general meaning of individual life, if the standard of living among the German masses is kept as low as recommended by some authors and politicians. Here, once again, the dictate of humanity coincides with the demand of reason. Why wait until refugees and other people, after living in Germany after the war for a certain period, report to the Allied Governments that conditions in Germany are so appalling that large parts of the population curse life every day and are likely to re-invest the warrior's death with the fatal glory attached to it under the Nazis? Refugees who want to help in the reconstruction of Germany will have no chance there, unless provisions are granted to facilitate constructive work on principle. Here again it becomes clear that the problem of the refugees, small though their number be, is in fact the problem of Germany and consequently of the Allies.

Therefore, assuming that the Allies view the return of refugees to Germany and Austria as possible, on what conditions would this return have to be undertaken? Allied spokesmen with undoubted authority have stated repeatedly that no refugee from Nazi oppression shall be compelled to go back to his old country. It can even be assumed that no one will be officially encouraged to do so. But what about the status of those who will volunteer? The Hitler Government has deprived all refugees of their German citizenship. Is this act of a government, which until the outbreak of war was recognised by all other governments as the lawful regime of Germany, to be declared null and void? Can human beings be deprived of their nationality and, afterwards, re-equipped with it by authoritative acts, without being consulted in either case? More-

over, what about all those other acts perpetrated by Hitler against refugees, such as confiscation of their fortunes, expropriation of their properties, banning of their professional activities? Many of the Jewish refugees express the view that, while actions of the Nazi Government inflicting upon them material loss are to be annulled and made good to some extent by compensation, the act depriving them of their nationality has to be regarded as valid and cannot now be revoked. This view cannot be defended in earnest. Either all acts of a once authoritative body are valid, or none of them is. It can be expected, however, that discussion of this problem will continue for some time and that a solution satisfying all parties may not be reached.

Meanwhile, for those who are anxious to return to Germany as soon as some order has been restored there, the following suggestions appear practical:

(1) They should be given documents in which it is clearly stated that they are under the protection of an international body for a certain period during which they will have to decide whether or not they are to be registered as German nationals. If it is their wish, the government of the new Germany will have to reorganise them as German citizens as soon as they apply for it. Should they themselves decide otherwise, they shall be entitled to return to the country where they were living during the war and either be naturalised there or retain the status as specified in the documents which have granted them international protection. Such or similar regulations should be of a compulsory character. Refugees, in particular of the younger generation, should not be given facilities for their return to Germany without protecting them from the consequences of a failure of their attempt. In other words, they should not be placed at the mercy of the new Germany before conditions there have developed sufficiently far to make sound judgment possible.

(2) Provisions should be made by which anti-Semitism is banned from German life. Anti-Semitic propaganda should be made a punishable offence, and militant anti-Semitism declared as a capital crime to be dealt with as has been established by the penal code of the Soviet Union. Furthermore, all university and school teachers who have been active teaching the so-called racial doctrine as sponsored by Hitler, must be dismissed; and all magistrates, judges, lawyers, physicians who have given support to anti-Semitic propaganda irrespectively of their being members of the Nazi party. Anti-Semitism of the clerical variety must be uprooted as mercilessly

as that sponsored by Nazism. A priest or clergyman, whatever his rank, who has lent his name or voice to racial persecution should be declared unworthy of teaching the Gospel of Christ.

* * * * *

Jewish refugees from Germany and Austria, whatsoever their differences of opinion and creed, have learned during the years of exile to recollect one fundamental truth which had slipped from their minds in the decades of comparative prosperity: that man can live without a banking account, but that he is doomed to perish if he gives up his self-respect. It was on this account that, more than three thousand years ago, half a million of stout-hearted men and women came together from all districts of the Egyptian empire, determined to emigrate from the totalitarian state of the Pharaohs and to build up communal living on the solid basis of the commands of wisdom and truth, afterwards codified and made commonly known as the Ten Commandments, with which no worldly authority however powerful and ruthless was allowed to interfere. It was only logical that the Jewish nation, originating from such anti-revolutionary action, was hated and persecuted by all those who were striving for world dominion on the absurd claim that this was allotted to them by Providence. From the warriors of Joshua and Gideon is a direct line of descent to the defenders of the Warsaw ghetto and the brave settlers on the hills and plains of Palestine. It is the spirit of service and helpfulness, the clinging to independence of thought, judgment and speech, and the strong sense of human dignity which forbids the worship of false gods, however risky such refusal may appear, which have formed the lasting tradition of Jewry and made it survive all its oppressors and persecutors from the Assyrians to the Nazis. Now more than ever before it is up to Jews, in commemoration of that ancient tradition, to demonstrate the absurdity of sacrificing to the Golden Calf and to persuade the victims of the old human scourge, the stultifying greed for power and profits, to re-build their shattered lives under the auspices of commonsense and common planning. For such is the meaning of the Law of the Lord.

Our Common Humanity

By

R. SORENSEN, M.P.

THE Jew is primarily a member of the human race. This human race has produced a Piltdown man and a Plato, a Jesus, a Nero, a Shakespeare, a Karl Marx and an Adolf Hitler; and two of these names indicate a racial branch some consider unique and others but one of many minor outgrowths. Whatever may be our preferences either in type or designation we need never to forget that all branches, and the blossom and fruit they bear, draw their sustenance from the same stem. This inescapable fact of our essential unity is more significant than our diversity.

The human race has learned to build huts and generating stations, has wandered over the face of the earth and has made music, has nurtured its dangerous young and has explored the labyrinths of consciousness, and from time to time has squandered its own blood in martial suicide or poisoned itself with persecution. Within every Adam and Eve dwells the same capacity that reaches to the peak or falls into the pit. A salutary reminder of this fundamental identity comes to us in that plea of Shylock to his own and ours:

“Hath not a Jew eyes? hath not a Jew hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? fed with the same food, hurt with the same weapons, subject to the same diseases, healed by the same means, warmed and cooled by the same summer and winter as a Christian is?”

Deeper than all aversions, complaints or repressions lies the simple answer to that Jew. He is a member of our human race, and his future is bound up with ours. The curses he has received are spawned from our common nature; the Ghetto he has endured has segregated Gentile as much as Jew; the pogroms and massacres through which he has passed are debasements of our human souls; his humiliation is also ours. The problem of Jewry, either now or at any time, cannot be isolated from the crucial issue of how humanity can ever become gracious and fair, and out of civilised brutality raise up children of God.

No toys on the market of A.D. 11,944 can yet be advertised, nor can it be ascertained whether by then Europe will be either just an

archaeological field for Tibetan research workers or a cheap weekend haunt of Australasian pleasure-seekers. What is certain, by all the vision we possess, is that the human race will never find fulfilment or peace until and unless the implicit moral law of its nature is obeyed. Racial self-preservation depends neither on medals for fecundity nor on mass consolidation; for multiplication of stock and treasure cannot arrest qualitative decline. Our need and our hope lies along the pathway of ethical integration. We have to learn the difficult art of loving our fellow-man not simply as a sentimental aspiration but as a social necessity. This fact William Blake translates in his simple lines:

And all must love the human form,
In heathen, Turk or Jew,
Where Mercy, Love and Pity dwell
There God is dwelling too.

There is no condescension in this but the same simple perception of truth as in the words of a Jew who quoted, "Love the Lord thy God . . . and thy neighbour as thyself"—or of those of one, inspired by Him, who wrote: "We are members one of another." If there be any descent at all it is from an artificial altitude of detachment to a sure foundation. The haughtiest of monarchs is ever fearful and lonely, and finds relief only when he can take tea and toast on a normal social level. Our trivial decorations become exposed as meaningless in the light of our fraternal relationship. Our paramount concern must be the achievement of a consciousness that acts as a catalyst to all our domestic, national and other groupings, and the first sign of this is in the exercise of toleration.

Yet nations themselves are social compounds, and the myth of a pure nation-race has become too palpably absurd for honest currency. We British are an interesting synthesis, and the U.S.A. is in the process of fusing discordant elements in Israel Zangwill's "Melting Pot," even though it is taking longer than he thought. There are seethings and bubblings in every crucible; for economic discordancies and social antipathies remain as yet unresolved. Nevertheless the U.S.S.R. in its own way appears to have reconciled Siberia with Turkestan, and has melted the colour bar, although the white men of Natal and Alabama receive such news with incredulity or contempt.

In time deep, wide fissures of mankind can be bridged, and vicious severances find harmony, even if blind resistance hampers and frustrates. The discerning mind perceives our ultimate human necessity beyond immediate obsessions such as anti-Semitism. It

sees the Jew, therefore, not as in a glass darkly but clearly as the fellow-man he was and is and ever will be.

There are, certainly, races within the race, and these will not diminish in the oncoming centuries. Some may disappear, even as some have disappeared, or almost so like the African bushmen or the Australian aborigines. But others will arise, given time and sufficient constant contiguity. The conflict of Baal and Yahweh in Israel is a reminder of those who worshipped different gods and pursued different paths. The Tower of Babel was a monument to linguistic differentiation when human society was relatively small. Those who were left beyond the horizon of knowledge pressed slowly through the centuries, implementing their special marks of culture and behaviour. Climate and food had their subtle cumulative influence on biological potencies, and specific characteristics grew out of a physiological and psychological confluence. Among these many variants anthropologists and ethnologists grope, patiently experimenting with classifications of long and square heads, curly and lank hair, pink and brown skins, Greek and Semitic features, and much else.

Can the Jew be neatly popped into a pigeon-hole? Is he a distinct race? If he is, it is difficult to determine his exclusive, singular characteristics, for we are swiftly reminded that Arabs and Assyrians possess confusing similarities, and are, in fact, also Semites.

There are, indeed, broad racial classifications that we use of necessity. But as for racial purity, it only exists insofar as man is not an ape. Within every species there are many sub-classifications, and if we trace back any alleged "pure human race" we shall find somewhere both fusion and confusion. The Hebrew is not "pure," and it is difficult to discriminate among the early peoples who dwelt in what we now call the Middle East between the homogeneousness of one tribe and another. Nor is Jewish physiognomy distinctive. It is a secondary biological variant by no means peculiar, even though it may now possess certain cultural religious and sociological associations. Nevertheless, since the Diaspora, whether under the stimulus of persecution or an innate restless enterprise the Jewish community has survived and now dwells within other communities, contributing much that is worthy to their encompassing host, but also somehow frequently evoking misgiving, apprehensions and hostility. At certain times and in certain areas, however, the Jew has been accepted as an interesting and valuable element in the national life, as was the case in Italy before, and even during, the major period

of the Fascist regime. Yet the tragic fact remains that often in history have come long or short, relatively mild or cruelly savage, waves of enmity. The Jew has become accustomed to this and now mourns the decimation of his people as but the twentieth-century version of their recurrent martyrdom.

All variations are liable to friction, for they appear to imperil a customary norm of social cohesion. So long as these are fractional they are tolerated as harmless idiosyncracies, but if they expand into larger proportions then there is alarm that can rise rapidly to a climax of revulsion. The odd can become the offensive, and the quaint a signal of danger. Red-haired men earn fame so long as they remain the novelty of one in a thousand, but let this increase to ten per cent and all the blondes and brunettes will form an Anti-Redhead Alliance to protect society against the "ginger peril." Irishmen imported into the industrial North during the last century were viewed with the same hostility not merely because of their economic threat but also because of their different religious and national habits. One Irishman in a mining village added spice to the daily round, but a hundred meant dynamite. So with Jewry. Enmity often depends on percentages.

This, however, is not the whole truth. Thus, Englishmen are now a majority in England, but ancient Britons, whom we call the Welsh, are content to return to their once-native land, not to reconquer it with sword or bomb but peacefully to penetrate it by joining the police force and opening dairies, and thus satisfy the English need of law and order and cups of tea. On the other hand the English in India are a very small community, and not always as popular as Colonel Blimp thinks they are. Minorities evidently may or may not be acceptable to majorities. There must therefore be some other reason why Jews are sometimes disliked than the fact that they are a minority or that they possess outstanding characteristics. If we can determine what this is we may then be able to encourage more consistent good behaviour and goodwill between groups of human beings, some of whose communal features are divergent in some respects. At least the understanding or misunderstanding can be appreciated, and the inescapable human basis be remembered.

Long before the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70 there was anti-Judaism. In fact Jerusalem fell because of it. Yet in those days persecution was no more confined to the Jews than in the Christian era. There was anti-Judaism, but there was also anti-Egyptianism, anti-Babylonianism, anti-Assyrianism and of course anti-Roman-

ism, according to fashion. Violence has always had its dialectic, and every tribe, nation, people, race, club, association, church or party is anti-enemy at one time or another. The fact that some groups hate or are hated proves nothing, save that human beings are able to hate, even to their own inner and outer detriment. The real question is whether there is some abnormal Hebraic factor to justify particular hostility to the Jewish people. One answer to this is that the Jews claim to be Providentially endowed and a "chosen race," thus by an alleged assumption of superiority fostering a spiritual arrogance and providing inevitable provocation.

Here, again, this is not altogether unique. We British have not always been modest in our pretensions nor without tacit agreement with the suggestion that so much of the map is tinted a British Imperial pink under Divine direction. All monarchs claim to reign by the Grace of God, and even His direct appointment, for the doctrine of the divine right of kings remains in a diluted form in some quarters. The attractive strains of "Land of Hope and Glory" with its petitionary affirmation of "God who made thee mighty, make thee mightier yet" at least intimates our desire to be chosen for such an expansive purpose. It is a natural inclination to believe that national characteristics, or at any rate our own national characteristics, are super-natural. The Greeks were apparently "chosen" to be contributors of art and philosophy, the Romans to be specialists in law and military organisation, the Italians to be vested with Catholic authority and to excel in grand opera, the Russians to achieve proletarian emancipation or Soviet Communism, the Danes to demonstrate agricultural co-operation, the Swiss to be the home of the International Red Cross (and if we descend to the mundane, watchmaking and tinned milk), and the North Americans to display engineering magnitude and incredible mastication. The august claim of Jewry that its special function has been to proclaim and preserve a moral monotheism may therefore be justified, as also the cultural and religious segregation that may have been appropriate to this. Even if there be only an important element of truth in this we should be grateful and not irritated by the fact. If human weaknesses have become associated so have they with all peoples with a mission, whether Christian or Imperialist.

Apart from or imbedded in the assumption there is also the traditional conviction that the historic suffering of Jewry was merited because of Jewish rejection of Jesus as the Messiah. This has been popular, even with some theologians, despite the condescending qualification that the Divine mercy might be exercised both

directly by the Deity Himself and indirectly mediated through the Christian attitude. It was as if Christians became embarrassed by remembering their own New Testament text that "God is Love," although even so it was not too difficult to adopt a cautious interpretation when practical necessity required it. Nevertheless, the inference remained that Judaism was more culpable than, say, Hinduism, and that it is somehow more disgraceful honestly to reject a theological postulate believed to be false than nominally to accept it and to become inconsistent in its moral translation.

This rejection is ambiguous. "Rejecting Christ" can mean several things. It can mean that every Jewish baby alive at the time of the Crucifixion or born since then has to be identified with the behaviour of a small crowd of partisans who yelled "Crucify Him." This out-Vansittarts Vansittart, for even that gentleman has explained he estimates there might be 25 per cent "good" Germans, even though he does not make it clear whether this refers to all German human beings, including children, or only to the adult population. In any case, he has recognised how insane it is completely to merge the iniquities of Hitlerism with the wretched inhabitants of concentration camps. Not so those Christians who lump together the whole Jewish community as having "rejected Christ." But, again, it can mean that all those who under duress became Christian can be put into a loftier category than those who have been trained to absorb the tenets of Judaism and have remained loyal adherents of that faith. It involves the further difficulty that among those who so claim to have accepted Jesus as the Christ there is considerable difference of conviction as to when this is authentic. Roman Catholics, for instance, would assert that those outside their fold have not truly accepted Him or they would not reject the Papal claim. There are also a good many protestant Christians who would deny the right of Unitarians to call themselves Christian. Altogether, the multitudinous Christian sects and denominations bear witness to the difficulty of defining authoritatively who are those who have truly not rejected Christ to a greater or less degree. Surely, the rejection that really matters is our rejection of His supreme ethic.

However, the ambiguity has not outweighed the comprehensive indictment, and Jewry accordingly has received the frowns of the gentle and the brickbats of the brutal. Prejudice and animosity, whatever may be other alleged justification, can always fall back on this assertion of a "racial" rejection of the means of human salvation. For this reason always there has lurked the pseudomystical

defence of the Ghetto, the yellow badge, the suppressions and the pogroms, the exclusion from many professions and callings, the appalling persecution and martyrdom of millions of human beings. The story of this harassing, bullying, torturing and humiliating of the Jews spreads throughout the last nineteen hundred odd years and becomes a disturbing undertone to the psalms and hymns of Christendom. It should stab every sensitive conscience into penitence at this shameful excuse for prolonged cruelty.

The effect of this persecution alone can explain a great deal of that element in Jewry which offends Gentile susceptibilities. The sharpness and slickness, the astuteness and assertiveness, alleged to be such irritating characteristics of some Jewish people, became nourished by conditions of repression. The human spirit is forced into agility in order to counterbalance the absence of normal mobility. Hold the bludgeon over a human being until he sinks into fearful obedience and it is not surprising if the victim becomes artful. If survival is threatened there are other means than defiant rage by which death can be averted. In fact the rage may precipitate extinction while a quick, persistent intelligence may outwit the persecutor. If one way out is barred, there may be other ways, including climbing under the barrier. Hence, it is necessary fully to assess the cumulative effect of centuries of ostracism, hatred and enmity in order to understand human reactions to these morbid experiences.

Yet it cannot be denied, whatever may be the extenuating circumstances, certain elements do appear offensive. The offended themselves may be equally guilty of other human weaknesses, it is true, and the mote and the beam need remembrance. But this does not mean no offending elements exist, and it would be insincere folly not to recognise that an evasion of this fact might leave an avoidable yet unremedied source of infection. It is not incapable of treatment, and Jews themselves are earnest in their endeavour to remove any excuse for the wrongs they endure. Statistics may be employed to prove or disprove certain accusations and yet it may remain true at the end that some kinds of misdemeanours and types of unsocial or unconventional behaviour are more common among Jews than Gentiles. Against this, however, it has also to be recognised that other forms of wrongful conduct are correspondingly rare among Jews, particularly those that outrage philoprogenitive principles; that other crimes or misconduct discredit other human communities; and that Jewish philanthropy and benevolence, Jewish endurance, energy, enterprise and culture have made invaluable social contributions.

With some Jews there is undoubtedly a religious rigidity that finds expression in a compact exclusiveness or in an adamant pride suggesting the obverse of the "herrenvolk" medal. Yet even with the strict, traditionally orthodox this need not be so, and there is much in our familiar Old Testament and the Talmud that exhorts kindness, good treatment and justice to the "stranger that is within thy gates." The "Wayside pulpits" frequently displayed outside synagogues are passing reminders of so much taken from Hebrew sources that, nevertheless, has universal human application. But not all Jews are traditionally orthodox, and with these, as with the unorthodox of other faiths, there are both moral contractions and expansions. The variations of ethical and social emphasis and form are considerable, and while the sophisticated man-of-the-world finds an affinity that makes his nominal Judaic or Christian faith irrelevant, and the good-hearted, sensitive and gracious possess a communion of spirit transcending theological divergence, no doubt the mass of ordinary folk approximate to an indefinite number of shades and grades of intermingled elements both inside and outside religious and racial frontiers. Whatever may be the truth underlying accusations of aggressiveness, ostentation, sharp practice or any other faults among Jewish people it is vitally necessary again and again to recall the supreme truth, platitudinous as it may seem, that the Jew is a human being, shares the range of fundamental need and capacity within the human race, and like all human beings is affected by his sociological environment. This can sweeten bitter waters of prejudice, whoever or whatever may be responsible for the unpalatable qualities.

It is well to estimate what would have been the effect on ourselves if we had belonged to a community which for centuries had suffered the same experience as the Jew. It is highly probable that we would also have absorbed unpleasing products of such treatment. And in our relative good fortune in not having had that experience perhaps we have ourselves not altogether escaped the faults of self-righteousness and inconsiderate judgment—surely as serious, even if more subtle, as those on which we concentrate in Jewry.

"O wad some pow'r the giftie gie us
To see ourselves as others see us!"

Moreover, we need to avoid the common failing, to which some reference has already been made, of identifying a whole community with one part of it, however obtrusive that part may seem, or of isolating possible vices from virtues in order then to obscure the

latter. It is a psychological trick, to which all of us are prone, so to fix our attention upon some unpleasing element, real or imaginary, and to vest it with emotional associations, as to become convinced that the aversion we then register is completely objective and not subjective. Anger and enmity can perform miracles in degenerate transubstantiation, and a face that once was pleasant becomes malignant or absurd to eyes that become charged with malice. Shakespeare in *Richard II*, Act III. Sc. II, speaks of:

“Sweet love, I see, changing his property,
Turns to the sourest and most deadly hate.”

Thus, let once a sour emotion possess us, let us once become bitter and frustrated with another, and even the ears that were once charming become grotesque to our sight, a posture becomes the symbol of detested qualities, eyes betray a newly found evil, and even an ordinary nose appears vicious. Sorry tricks of baleful emotional intoxication are these, and by them even the best are caught. On the other hand, let generous feeling and positive goodwill be sovereign and the commonplace becomes aglow with good qualities. To this extent beauty may be in the eye of the beholder, or it may be that good qualities remain hidden until vision is charged with generous perception.

There are other communal groups than the Hebrew that acquire their own antipathies. Roman Catholics, Freemasons, Communists, Plymouth Brethren, Bookmakers, Parsons and Curates, Vegetarians, American negroes, Gipsies and Teachers can all to a greater or less degree fluster or repel, draw criticism or scorn, from those outside their sphere. Their behaviour seems odd or foolish, quaint or suspicious, and reactions stretch from good-humoured detachment to positive loathing. Consider also, for instance, the prevalence of “caste,” or the racial conflict of Africander, Briton, Indian, Poor White and “Native,” in South Africa.

Our own gang is always superior to the gang in the next street, and to our childish minds it sounds outrageous to plead there can be any real similarity. “I hate, hate, hate, the French!” cried Nelson. No doubt he did, quite genuinely, and when he bombarded Copenhagen, possibly also the Danes. But the French in time became less and less the objects either of our levity or our enmity, and became our brave allies. No longer ludicrous “Froggies” but “Comrades in Arms”! There is a deduction to be drawn from this, not exclusively applicable to Jews.

These reflections on human bias and ephemeral reactions are important in any consideration of the future of the Jewish people.

even as it is necessary to appreciate the historic background before we can determine future advance. Future plans are conditioned not merely by present circumstances but also by the nature of that for which we plan. A problem exists that calls urgently for solution, but the solution must not be just a convenient expedient. Nor must it be simply a mechanical adjustment. Human beings are not cattle who can be shoved or enticed into some distant corral, or by some arrangement separated into different sheds where they may cause least disturbance. There are deep issues for mankind in this Jewish problem, issues that involve the human soul and challenge our fundamental ethic. Neither separation nor assimilation meets this issue, for with the Jew out of the way either by distance or miscegenation, the problem has been met not by a solution but by an evasion. The cardinal point is, what is needful not when Jew and Gentile become utter strangers but when they are neighbours? Here, within society, they dwell together in the same street and meet in the same bus. Is this intolerable? If so, why? If difficult and generating an undercurrent of friction liable some time to explode, still the question is, why? And is there no alternative?

Proximity becomes intolerable when there is no common point of contact, or the human foundation is cluttered with secondary things. When there is no provision both for diversity and for unity, when the sense of human relationship is lost through insensitivity or through pride, when we have neither space for our own peculiarities nor inspiration for common effort, then conflict is bred, and we strike out neurotically or become sardonic introverts. Wisdom is required that arises from a deep appreciation of the fine complexity of the human spirit, and not just the wisdom of Solomon, who was simply shrewd and ingenious. The tensions and antipathies of the human race are but magnifications of unresolved subconscious conflicts in the individual. And even as the healing of the individual must in the end be within himself, so that the discordancies are reconciled within a life made whole, so it is within the racial life the therapeutic process must succeed. In other words, we must assume that Jews and Gentiles must somehow find concord in the same street, even if and though some Jews wish to build up their own localised life, such as Palestine might offer.

Zionism makes a strong appeal to Jews and Gentiles alike, although not necessarily for the same reasons. To the former there is the attraction of rejoicing in a national home. To the latter there may be an eager desire that the home should swiftly relieve the Gentile of an unattractive neighbour. We may fervently cry "God

speed" as a euphemism for "Good riddance." But this moral deception can spread viciously to other neighbours when the Hebrew pantechicon has disappeared round the corner. The process of encouraging elimination can continue until it ends with our little domestic family making war on all other families. Even this is but a prelude to a family row ending in the several members of a household disappearing in the night. To avoid such ultimate disintegration, domestic or social, we have to avoid its inception, and recognise the inevitability of neighbours becoming neighbourly if they are to escape becoming enemies. There are some Zionists who appear to believe that all Jews everywhere should prepare to inhabit Palestine, even if disinclined or even averse. Apart from the practical difficulty of settling 20,000,000 or so in a small area, and the effect of overwhelming the Arabs, it is the fact that not even all Zionists wish to undertake the venture. The less extreme claim is that all those should be assisted to go who wish to go, or who have found life elsewhere too burdensome. For these, it is urged, the way should be opened out broadly, so that no barriers should cause any to hesitate or be turned back. It is difficult to estimate how many in fact would take advantage of such an opportunity, if it were to exist. There would indeed be large numbers who would make no such choice, but who would insist on remaining where they are or in a land they also call their native soil. They have two skins, and to them both are essential.

There is nothing necessarily incongruous in this duality, any more than there is in being a Christian Englishman, a Russian Communist patriot, or a German American citizen. We all dwell within intersecting circles. With those, however, who by birth or choice have become a part of the warp and woof of a particular national life, whose cultural, commercial and political contacts are strong and penetrating, and whose attachment to familiar environment is as natural as it is to non-Jews, their transference, save by compulsion, to some other area of the world is quite unthinkable. Indeed, they would resent any suggestion that thus they must demonstrate a complete singularity, as much as Disraeli would have done when Prime Minister of the Queen and the British Parliament. The Primrose Day pilgrimage to his statue at Westminster makes the fact that he was an Anglican Jew quite secondary to the fact that he was a great British Imperialist. Scotsmen have also been Prime Ministers but not even a majority of Scotsmen wish to confine all Scotsmen to north of the Tweed.

A great deal of controversy and recrimination has raged around

the Balfour Declaration, and argument about the respective significance of "a" and "the" will still proceed. Thus, while the Declaration stated, "His Majesty's Government view with favour the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people . . .", the Labour Party gave more positive interpretation of this in 1943 by declaring, "...in favour of building Palestine as the Jewish National Home. . . ." Not surprisingly, therefore, came the bitter outburst when Malcolm MacDonald in 1939 issued a White Paper and explained the restrictive policy of the British Government respecting further Jewish immigration to Palestine. And the Arab riots and rebellions of pre-war days provided dramatic material to substantiate that policy. Settlement has proceeded, and notwithstanding lamentably tragic refusals to accept hapless refugees some of these have augmented the pioneers. It remains to be seen how far Arab-Jew feuds have permanently receded when the impact of war has gone.

There will be in any case a considerable Jewish population and Tel Aviv, along with the co-operative farms, will remain both to demonstrate Jewish enterprise and idealism and to contribute richly to Jewish and Arab economic well-being. Tact and diplomacy, and above all generous guarantees and safeguards extended to the Arabs, will do much to avert a recrudescence of former animus. This should enable the Jewish quota to be greatly enlarged, but even so it would be unwise to attempt to flood Palestine with a completely unrestricted host of new settlers, even if practical difficulties were far less. To contemplate the exodus from Europe into Palestine of millions of Jews would be more trouble than it is worth—to Jewry. This, however, does not preclude the possibility of a substantial expansion.

What then of those Jews who cannot or will not be, or wish not to be accommodated in their venerable territorial homeland? In Northern Europe will remain a vast number of survivors from the agony this race has suffered. With the disappearance of their sadistic persecutors there will be far less incentive to seek far-off lands, although doubtless many will be pathetically anxious to fly from the area of their torture. Some anti-Semitic elements will remain to offer a silent menace, but one can only hope that a reborn democratic and rational life will provide a powerful antidote. There will probably be the two inclinations, the one to start afresh with new hope though with ineradicably sad memories, and the other to find some other place of habitation. For the latter, apart from Palestine, some few areas of the earth may prove suitable and

hospitable, but these will cover but a minority. Neither British Dominions nor the U.S.A. are likely to open very wide their gates. There remains the probability that the bulk of surviving European Jewry will continue to be European Jewry, whether remaining precisely within their former spheres, or needing new ones.

For both of these the Peace Settlement and plans for the reconstruction of Europe should make definite provision for their protection and welfare, resting upon an international agreement to which great and small Powers alike give their solemn signature. Racial discrimination must be abjured, and the one test for Jew and Gentile must be that of good citizenship and loyalty. This may seem a counsel of perfection not attainable within a world where bitterness, suspicion, enmity and moral perversion will still brood. Yet there is the Atlantic Charter, whose spirit can be honoured and amplified, even if unhappily its letter has become a scrap of paper. If that spirit somehow cannot ride the storm then it will not simply be Jewry that will founder but the whole human race of the West. However slow or difficult it may be, we need as Europeans to devote ourselves in heroic faithfulness to the task of international and social moral achievement, and in this is set our obligation to restore or to establish the civic equality of the Jew with the Gentile.

Nevertheless, it may well be that specific areas must be set aside within Europe wherein Jewish communities may dwell. A similar experiment to this appears not to have had great success in the U.S.S.R., and time may prove this to be abortive elsewhere. Yet the opportunity should be afforded under international safeguard and supervision, a variation of the mandatory system operative since the last war. It is unlikely that sovereign authority would be granted, for existing sovereign Powers have not reached the moral height of making the self-sacrifice of even a small part of their territory, and to insist on areas being confiscated from the vanquished Powers would mean fuel for further conflagration. But even if such extravagant projections be unreasonable it should not be impossible within a new, imaginative European policy to create zones of colonisation for those Jews who are attracted thereto.

The greater proportion will prefer to remain associated with an existing national fraternity, and these should have political and civic guarantees, internationally honoured. Equally, to avoid or minimise accusations of unfair enterprise, frequently exaggerated, an international convention should be adopted respecting alleged industrial, commercial and social malpractices, applicable without discrimination to all peoples. This, however, cannot be detached

from the economic order prevailing, and the degree to which fundamental economic transformation will be reached in post-war years will vary from state to state. Without such a transformation all codes are liable to become irrelevant, for excellent principles need their appropriate economic basis if they are to thrive. It is alleged of the League of Nations that its failure was due in large measure to an inadequate relationship of its liberal principles to urgent economic needs, as if cut flowers were expected permanently to live and grow in a vase. It is equally delusive to assume that the rank, sour soil of competitive avarice or a swamp that encourages elemental impulses of greed can nourish social ethics. Yet the firm and undiscriminating legal suppression of vicious or unwholesome practices, provided this be related to the whole body politic and economic, would prove beneficial.

There remains the fact that the Jewish community within the national community will continue into the future, and diversity has to find toleration and goodwill within unity. Many Jews will still appear curious in habit and custom to non-Jews, and those Jews have themselves to consider how they may remove unnecessary sources of irritation. They will exercise those same qualities of restraint, generosity and understanding expected of Gentiles, and of all who profess the ultimate fulfilment of mankind to be through fraternity. Hallowed religious observances will continue to be revered, and for these there must be social toleration as much for the Roman Catholic citizens of Liverpool, the Moslem seamen of Cardiff, the Welsh valley chapelgoers, the Scottish Kirk attenders, the street-corner Salvationists or the suburban park rationalists. "Live and let live" may be somewhat innocuously trite, yet it embraces an essential social virtue. The Jew has a right to live, if we cherish life aright. He has as much right to insist on Kosher meat as a Catholic has to a meatless Friday, or as anyone else has to go hatless or to collect stamps, drink beer or learn the ukulele. But more, he has the right to be respected, as well as the duty to respect. Elementary facts, these may seem, but the first step on the pathway. The second is toleration. Even this is inadequate, for goodwill must follow, and with it appreciation and a sense of common humanity. With that alone are the other qualities sustained, for otherwise toleration may become detachment degenerating into enmity, and "live and let live" into anarchic isolation.

It is in the disposition of our values within human consciousness where sequences are determined, and it is in the richer appreciation of the significance of human variations within racial experience

that is generated an acceptance of the Jew as a neighbour and as a present or potential friend. The Jew is a human being. He may seem odd and strange, but so do we all to some other people. It is those factors that provide the test of our humanity, and reveal whether this is heroic or treacherous. We have to learn to put up with each other, and not to let our own conceits impel us towards our own or others' segregation. Either we attain that art or we shall find ourselves without original intention, lumbering down the steps of a Munich beer-hall and out again to prepare for a future world intolerable to the dignity, nobility and sanity of the human race.

"And who is my neighbour?" quoted Jesus. We have still to learn and apply the answer.

Epilogue

By

LOUIS GOLDING

I HAD been sitting at my desk for hours, my pen in my hand. I do not exaggerate: for hours. It had been proposed to me that I should write an epilogue for a book to be entitled: "The Future of the Jews," an epilogue, in fact, for the book you hold in your hand. It had been suggested that, as a novelist and a Jew, I might permit myself to strike a somewhat more personal note than the other contributors, most of whom are neither novelists nor Jews.

So I sat down at my desk to consider the matter from the especial angles assigned to me by destiny and by the present Editor. The Future of the Jews. . . . The Future of the Jews. But my mind refused, or found itself unable, to look towards future history. I was compelled to look backward, very nearly half a century ago. And not upon any such grandiose spectacle as the past history of the Jews. No, it was the spectacle of my own clan, my own family.

Why was I so constrained? Why did the hours so numbly pursue each other across these dark decades? I will tell you. It is because during these hours I have been so happy and so full of terror. I am sitting at a desk in a high room in a lovely house in northern Scotland. As I turn my head and look out through the open window on my left hand, I gaze upon a vista of lawns and dark woods and secret pools. The woods slope down to a hurrying stream as clean as a sword. Beyond the stream are meadows; beyond the meadows a great sweep of moorland invests the whole sky.

I am happy because of all this beauty; because when I rise from my desk and go down to join my friends there will be pleasant conversation, and laughter, and wine, and silly games; and the women will have jolly frocks on, and the white spaniel will be chewing somebody's shoelace, and the wood will be spluttering in the huge hearth, and shall I mix you a gin and vermouth, there's still some pre-war vermouth left; no, thanks awfully, there's still some dry sherry, isn't there?

And all the time I have been so happy during these numb hours, I have been full of terror. Why? Because somebody said "Hamburg."

I don't know what the context was. It may have been a nostalgic

recollection of that pre-war Hamburg, the roystering pubs of the Reeperbahn, and the green copper roofs of the churches, and the swans on the sunny stretches of the Alster Lake. Or it may have been the Hamburg of the blasted submarine-pens and the smouldering shipyards. But neither of these Hamburgs was the place that suddenly touched with an icy thumb the shuddering stuff of my heart.

No. It was a Hamburg of some decades before those. I, in fact, wasn't born yet, not by a year and a half. It wasn't the spacious city I was later to know, or the smoking ruin the airmen were to know. All that there was of my Hamburg was a few square yards of wooden quayside, and a gangway leading into the steerage quarters of a ship, and a howling wind, and no moon and stars.

And my father and mother had just arrived there *en route* for England, after a long journey from Cherkassy in the Ukraine. They had with them some bales of bedding, and a samovar, and the Friday night candlesticks, and some silver beakers. And the children, of course: all but one child, a little girl who had died on the journey, a sister I was destined not to see (for, as I have said, I was not born yet).

They were all miserable, and they were tired. They were frightened of the ship, and the howling wind, and the strange sea, the strange land they were bound for.

And it happened that a certain Jew was with them, an inhabitant of Hamburg—though a native of Russia, like my parents. He emerges from the dim narrative as a man of some substance. He had two heavy gold rings and wore a pearl tiepin, but he had a first-class beard and ear-locks; he was everything he should be. I imagine that he must have had some sort of a job to look after Jewish transmigrants on behalf of the local community.

Well, this gentleman seems to have taken a fancy to my father, who was, indeed, a man of charm.

"Listen," said he. "What do you want to go to England for, why? It is a country of ignorant ones. Why not stay on here in Hamburg? We could do well with a new *maggid*, a new orator in the synagogue. You will be on your feet in no time; you, and your wife, and your children, God bless them! Well, what do you say, Reb Feivel?"

And the night was so dark, and the wind so noisy, and they were all so tired, that, in fact, my father was within an ace of gathering them all up, the wife and the children, the bedding and the samovar, and turning his back upon that ship and upon England. What

happened then has never been explained to me clearly. There was a sudden machine-gun rattle of orders, very crisp, very German. There was a sudden panic among the Goldings, the women wringing their hands, the children yelling. A minute later the ship had engulfed them. The kind man returned to Hamburg, with his excellent beard, his gold rings and his pearl tiepin. We others made for England, for Manchester, in fact.

In course of time I was born there, a little English Jew. Not a German Jew. *Not a German Jew*, I repeated to myself, with a contraction at the base of the scalp, as I looked out over the shaven green lawns, with the gay flowers in the borders. (Just this side of the lily-pond there is a dovecot. The doves are talking to each other sleepily, the seven white doves, and the one black one.) *Not a German Jew*. A terror came into my eyes. It had been like the toss of a coin. The nice gentleman from the Hamburg Jewish Community might so very easily have had his way. He did not. The coin did not fall that way. It did not matter much to him, of course.

But it has mattered a lot to me, and to my folk. You will not misunderstand me. I do not maintain it would not have been an inspiring thing to be born a German Jew, like Heine, or Einstein, or Ehrlich. But by now, for over ten years, it would have been a tragic thing. Would I have been still mouldering in a concentration camp? I speculated, looking towards, but not seeing, the heathery moorland. Or would I have caved in long ago, beaten to pulp by a length of lead piping? Where by now would be the youngsters of my boyhood, the girls I loved, the boys who were my friends?

Hamburg! The word was like a naked and terribly bright light. I not merely felt, I saw, with infinitely vivid particularity, the desolation of all German Jews, the myriads that are dead, the few that are captives, the few who went free.

But it was the *capriciousness* of it all that so terrified me, it might have been me so very easily. Fifty-fifty, the toss of a coin. Or any Jew with a more or less quiet mind at this moment, in England, in Australia, in the United States of America. There, but for the grace of God, oh brother Jew, in the Harmony Club of New York, or distilling test-tubes in the laboratories of Haifa, or fighting the good fight in the approaches to the Dark Tower—there, but for the grace of God, go you or I.

And must it be always so, I asked myself, with resentment and with anger, that the toss of a coin may decide for a Jew the choice between normal well-being and perdition, for himself and his dependants? Perhaps (I told myself wistfully) the hideous possi-

bility is only engendered in the most fateful conjunctions of history, which, in the nature of things, must be rare. But what is "rare"? Once in a hundred years, once in a thousand?

What does the Future hold, I asked myself; and my mind swung over darkly from the individual past of a Jew, to the collective future of his people.

Palestine. That was the first word that came up out of the speculation and the foreboding. Palestine. I fail to see (I told myself) that there is a history of the Jews without a Jewish Palestine. I take it for granted that the people who are reading this book accept the desirability of a future for the Jews. A few may still be old-fashioned Victorian Internationalists, and hope that some day the boundaries between peoples and nations may become dimmer than they are now and will at length be obliterated. I think that the events of the few years that began in the first days of September 1939 will considerably have depleted the ranks of that kind of Utopian Internationalist. None the less, those kindly people will probably feel now, as firmly as outright Nationalists, that a nation which has cherished its national dream for less than one millennium, as in the case of the Czechs or the Irish—or for two millennia, as in the case of the Jews—that such a nation must be allowed to achieve or re-achieve its nationhood, for at least so many centuries as the impetus towards nationhood remains fervent. These people, therefore, must accept the validity of the passion of millions of Jews who to-day yearn to set up old altars again in Palestine, as of the millions beyond computation whose dream it has been during these nostalgic epochs of dispossession.

We who cherish the Zion dream will be told that there are actually large communities of Jews, particularly in America, who have no desire at all to see a Jewish Zion re-established. So be it then. Let them withhold their support from those Jews who feel that only in Zion a Jew has the chance of attaining his full personal and national stature. Let them withhold their support, though I, for one, will feel that they are pusillanimous. But for heaven's sake let them curb their hostility. If they do not wish to go to Palestine, nobody asks them to. And in fact there is another type of Jew, among whom I may myself be numbered, who feels himself to be so deeply rooted in the associations, and the friendships, and the loves, of the land he has lived in for one or two generations, or for many more generations, that he knows it will be foolish for him to deracinate himself. None the less, even this type of Jew

will find from generation to generation refreshment and inspiration in the old fountains that will be set flowing again in the far-off land of his ultimate origin. So, to give no more than an approximate parallel, do British folk from the British Dominions (and British folk from the United States, none the less) find their spirits deeply refreshed upon their return to their British Homeland; and they go back again to the new land at the other ends of the earth where they have taken root, with their loyalties not in the least impaired, with only their souls' lamps burning brighter for this replenishment.

It can be anticipated that, as time elapses—and disregarding the possibility of the return to men's minds, for a long time to come, of the sort of Victorian Internationalism I spoke of earlier—it can be anticipated, I say, that in the main two types of Jew will evolve. First there will be the Jew of the National Homeland, talking Hebrew, harking back to his own cultural roots at the same time as he is building up a new Hebraic civilisation of the type already so brilliantly foreshadowed in the Palestinian communities. He will be in his own place.

The Jew in the Diaspora will tend to divide himself into two varieties: first there will be the Jew who still feels profoundly the call of Zion, despite the continuing divorce of his own immediate clan from the Jewish Homeland. He will tend to move to Zion exactly as he did in the years between the two wars when the Palestine experiment was being set up on its feet. Despite Oxford or Harvard, despite the Kurfürstendamm or Broadway, the call of the hills of Jerusalem, of the meadows of Sharon, of the blue waters of Tiberias, was too much for him, and he went. And in the days to come this Jew, atavist as he may seem to be, will go again. Even in Russia he has been known to make his way out of the collective farm and factory of the new system towards the works of a system much older than Lenin and Stalin, written down long ago in a language that Lenin and Stalin, at least officially, deplored.

And there will be manifest a second variety of Jew in the Diaspora, though one increasingly less manifest as history evolves. In fact he will be exactly the same Jew, half Jew, quarter Jew, eighth Jew, who has been woven into the fabric of every country on earth. He has married into the Gentile folk around him, or his children have, or they will. These are the assimilators, the disappearers. And if they choose that destiny, who is to say nay to them?

Now all these are, so to speak, teleological considerations. But with respect to the more immediate future, what of the problem of anti-Semitism? Is it true, or is it not true, that anti-Semitism is on

the increase in our own country, and presumably in the United States? I think almost certainly that it is true. Despite the political and military defeats of Hitler, his ideological campaign may still be gathering momentum. It has been longer prepared than the others, and its tenets are much more widely and subtly diffused. Political and military successes may be countered and frustrated. You destroy an army at Stalingrad; you give back its political frontiers to Czechoslovakia. But the virus of calumny lodges where the operations both of siege guns and of the pens of statesmen cannot penetrate to undo the evil work. It seems to me that all that Jews can do, and people of goodwill throughout the world, is to take full cognisance of this. I do not mean to say that, so to speak, they must merely grin and bear it, but they must not be disheartened by it. This evil miasma, too, will roll away. But alas, it must lie heavily in the valley bottoms for many seasons to come, till the sun and the wind have dispersed it.

But that is not enough, I will be told. Yes, that is not enough. I will say at once that, in my view, until Christian teaching makes an absolutely sharp and decisive differentiation between that remote handful of Jews who were involved in the Crucifixion, and all the world's Jews of the succeeding millennia, there will always be a residuum of semi-conscious anti-Semitism in even enlightened Christian minds. Christian teaching will have to be much more emphatic on the truth that Jews were just as much responsible for the success of Christianity as they had already been responsible for the establishment of the Moral Law. Perhaps as notable a day in the history of the well-being of the Jews as the day of the death of Haman, and the day of the death of Hitler, will be the day when the High Pontiff of Rome will expunge from the Catholic Liturgy the prayer which intercedes with the Lord: "*et pro perfidis judeis.*"

And the Jews themselves—what can they do towards the elimination of anti-Semitism? I have elsewhere, in a little book called *The Jewish Problem*, stated my conviction that the Jewish problem is in essence a Gentile problem. I do not see how any advice can be given to the Jews generically, because they are subdivided into a multitude of communities whose manners and methods and ideas and ideals are as infinitely varied amongst each other as are men's minds and faces in any fortuitous grouping anywhere on earth. Can it be suggested to them that they should be less clannish? Sometimes the objection is that they are not clannish enough. (I have already said earlier that they certainly are not clannish enough to agree on the Zionist idea.) Should I suggest they might, as a community, be less interested in money, less assertive in their manners, or this or that or

Louis Golding

the other thing? But how impertinent such counsel would be! Who does not know among the Jews he knows, certain ones pathologically subdued, starrily uninterested in money? I repeat, any generalised counsel is impertinent. Anti-Semitism is an evil like cannibalism or pneumonia. The first of these two is more or less eliminated; the second is being attacked, hip and thigh, and will disappear; so, in God's good time, will anti-Semitism, that foolish and ignominious thing.

Index

AGRICULTURE, Jews in, 29, 43, 68-69, 83-84, 112

America. *See* U.S.A.

Angell, Sir Norman, 77-78

Arabs, 53, 65-66, 68, 70, 76-80, 88-92, 114, 180

Argentine, 84

Askhenazim, the, 47

Assimilation, 30, 58-66, 72, 108-109, 155, 188

Atlantic Charter, 86, 130, 181

Australia, 53-54, 115, 116-117

Austria, 21, 26, 31, 34

Austro-Hungarian Empire, 20-21, 23

BALFOUR OF BURLEIGH, Lord, 71

Balfour Declaration, 29, 83, 92, 179-180

Belgium, 68-69

Belloc, Hilaire (quoted), 102

"Bernheim Petition," 125-126

Birobidjan, 84, 107

Brazil, 54

British Commonwealth, 53, 54, 70, 115-119

CANADA, 115

"Cantonal" system, 53

Churchill, Right Hon. Winston, 16, 140, 145, 147

Civil rights, 30, 31, 33, 36, 64, 87, 122, 124, 155

Cultural achievements. *See* Literature and Music

Czarism, 21-22, 23, 61, 101

Czechoslovakia, 17-18, 24, 26, 31, 36

DIASPORA, the, 42, 59, 74, 80, 83, 171

Dollfuss, Dr., 31

ECONOMIC BARRIERS, 27, 28, 30, 31, 33, 36, 113, 124

Edict of Toleration (1782), 48

Educational barriers, 27, 30, 33

Einstein, Albert, 14

Emigration, 29, 115-119. *See also* Immigration

England. *See* Great Britain

Evian Conference, 34

FIGHTING FORCES, Jews in, 21, 22, 39, 112

Finance, Jews in, 49, 112

Freud, Sigmund, 14, 49

Fried, Alfred H., 138*n*.

GERMANY, 13-16, 19-24, 26, 31-40, 46, 48, 51, 62-63, 86, 95, 97, 107, 108, 125-127, 134-168

Great Britain, 51-54, 76, 83, 89, 90-91, 94-100, 110-119, 155-158, 162

HAAM, Ahad, 74

Haber, Fritz, 140

Haskalah Movement, 74

Hechalutz Movement, 29

Herzl, Theodor, 72, 73-74, 75

Hillel, 43

Hindus, Maurice (quoted), 106

Hirsch, Baron, 84

Historical background, 41-48, 59-62

Hitler. *See* Germany

Horthy, Admiral, 30

Hungary, 23, 30, 36, 85

Huxley, Julian, 46

IMMIGRATION, 16, 38, 53-54, 87, 90, 110, 115-119

Industry, Jews in, 28, 113

International Arbitrary Commission (proposed), 133

International Court of Justice (proposed), 133

International Labour Office, 36

International Socialist Congress (Stuttgart, 1907), 67

JACOB, Berthold, 146-147

Janovsky, O. I. (quoted), 121

Jaurès, Jean, 67-68

Jerusalem, 41, 42

Jerusalem, Mufti of, 89, 90

Jewish Agency for Palestine, 86, 90

Jewish Army (proposed), 39, 144

Jewish Colonisation Association, 84

Jewish Commonwealth. *See* Jewish National Home

Jewish National Home, 29, 52, 65-66, 67-70, 73-82, 87-92, 114, 130, 178-182, 187-188

Jewish State. *See* Jewish National Home

Jewish Workers' League (Bund), 67

KAECKENBECK, G. (quoted), 126, 130

Kulischer, Eugene M. (quoted), 36

LEAGUE OF NATIONS, 24-25, 34, 83, 89, 121-127, 181

Lenin, 103, 104, 106

Literature, Jewish influence on, 45, 61

Luther, Martin, 47-48

MCDONALD, James J., High Commissioner for Refugees, 34

Mahler, Gustav, 14

Mair, L. P. (quoted), 133

Mandate for Palestine, 83, 86, 89, 90-91

Mavor, Professor James (quoted), 104

"Medical Policy Association," 52

Minorities Treaties, 121-127

Minority laws, 24

Minority rights, 28, 80, 81, 87, 121-133

Index

- " Misrachi " movement, 74
 Montefiore, Claude, 82
 Moscow Declaration (1943), 130, 141, 148
 Mosley, Sir Oswald, 94, 110
 Music, Jewish talent in, 14
- NATIONAL ARBITRARY COMMISSION (proposed), 132
 National Council for Civil Liberties, 99, 113
 " New Economic Policy " (NEP), 105
 New Zealand, 54, 115
 " Nuremberg Laws," 33, 126
- PAASSEN, Pierre van, 146
 Palestine, 18, 29, 39, 40, 43, 52-53, 59, 64, 65-66, 67-70, 75-82, 83-92, 114, 130, 144, 155, 178-182, 187-188
 Peace Treaties (1919), 23-25, 121
 Pinsker, Dr. Leo (quoted), 127-128
 Poale Zion (Jewish Labour Movement), 67
 Poland, 23, 24, 25-28, 33, 39, 95*n.*, 122, 125-127
 Political status, 27-28, 29, 60, 87, 120-133, 155
 Propaganda, 95-98, 107, 108, 128
 Protection of Minorities, 120-124
 Prussia, 136-137
- " RACE THEORIES," 46-47, 171
 Rathenau, Walther, 139-140
 Religion, 41-42, 43, 47-48, 56, 58, 71-72, 74, 173-176
 Robinson, Jacob (quoted), 124
 Roman Empire, 41-42, 59
 Roosevelt, President Franklin D., 34, 53
 Roth, Cecil, 147
 Royal Commission on Palestine (1937), 89
 Rumania, 23, 24, 28, 36, 95*n.*, 122
- Russia (Czarist), 21-22, 23, 61, 84, 93, 101. *See also* U.S.S.R.
 Russian Revolution, 101-104
- SCHLESINGER, Dr. Georg, 140
 Schönberg, Arnold, 14
 Schuschnigg, Dr., 31
 Schwartzbart, Dr., 143
 Science, Jewish prowess in, 14, 140
 Seibert, Theodor (quoted), 106
 Sephardim, the, 47
 South Africa, 115
 Spain, 60-61
 Spinoza, 43
 Stahl, Friedrich Julius, 139
 Stalin, Marshal, 103, 106
 Steinberg, A. (quoted), 103
 Stillschweig, Dr. K. (quoted), 126
 Stöcker, Pastor, 139, 149
 Sudetenland, 34
 Switzerland, 15, 53
- TEMPERLEY, H. W. V. (quoted), 127
 Treitschke, Heinrich von, 139
 Trotsky, Leo, 102-103, 104, 106
- U.N.R.R.A. (United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Association), 130*n.*
 Upper Silesia, 125-127
 U.S.A., 29, 34, 53-54, 99, 117-118
 U.S.S.R., 25, 64, 84-85, 99, 101-109, 116, 181. *See also* Russia (Czarist)
- WASSERMANN, August von, 14
 Weizmann, Dr. Chaim, 75, 86
 White Paper on Palestine (1939), 90
 Wright, Quincy (quoted), 133
- ZAKKAI, Jochanan Ben, 43
 Zionism, 29, 52-53, 65-66, 67-70, 71-82, 83-92, 114, 130, 178-182, 187-190
 Zionist Congress (1937), 90
 Zionist Movement. *See* Zionism
 Zygielbojm, Zygmunt, 150

Biographical Notes

SIR NORMAN ANGELL. One of most outstanding fighters against Fascism and for preservation of international peace. Was awarded Nobel Peace Prize in 1933. Member of Council of Royal Institute of International Affairs since 1928. *The Great Illusion* probably most important of all his works.

ELISABETH ACLAND ALLEN. Has been General Secretary of National Council for Civil Liberties since 1941, and is member of the Women's Liberal Federation Executive Committee. Educated at London School of Economics and at German High School for Politics, Berlin. Became Joint International Secretary of International Peace Campaign in 1936 and joined staff of British Committee for Refugees from Czechoslovakia in 1939.

S. ADLER-RUDEL. Born in Bukowina. Joined the Zionist Socialist Movement in his early youth and became a leading figure of this Movement in Austria and Germany. For a long period was closely connected with relief work for the German-Jewish Community. Is a recognised expert on Jewish relief and emigration problems, and, as such, is closely associated with the Council of German Jewry in London. In his capacity as an expert on relief and emigration questions was sent several times during this war to neutral countries on behalf of the Jewish Agency for Palestine. Has been instrumental in organising the emigration of many Jews from Hitler Europe.

M. CORBETT ASHBY. One of the most distinguished of women politicians. Appointed a substitute Delegate for United Kingdom to Disarmament Conference, 1931-35. Well known for her work in connection with Women's Suffrage, as a lecturer, and as President of Pensions Appeal Tribunal. Contested Parliament as Liberal on various occasions. Born 1882, was educated at home and Newnham College, Cambridge. Classical Tripos and B.A., Dublin. Married to Mr. Ashby, Barrister of Inner Temple, and has one son, Dr. Michael Ashby, now in Army.

BLANCHE E. C. DUGDALE. Niece of late First Earl of Balfour, and his official biographer. Her interest in Jewish problem dates back before first Great War; her active participation in Zionist work, through writing and lecturing, began after granting of Balfour Declaration. Member of Executive Committee of Association for National Home in Palestine. In addition, acted for some eight years as head of information department of League of Nations Union H.Q. in London.

Biographical Notes

LOUIS GOLDING. Well-known author of several novels, among them *Mr. Emmanuel*, *Magnolia Street*, etc., most of which are distinguished for their Jewish background. Born in Manchester in 1895. Educated at Manchester Grammar School and Queen's College, Oxford. At present engaged on new novel with Jewish setting, *The Glory of Elsie Silver*.

ELIAS JOSEPH HELLER. Was born in Lithuania and studied Law and Philosophy in Leningrad and Berlin. Was engaged on work as sub-editor and contributor, on *Encyclopaedia Judaica* 1926-33. In 1938 came to England, where he has been teaching Hebrew and Russian at L.C.C. Evening Classes, and lectured on philosophy at Morley College and Mary Ward Settlement. His publications include books on philosophy, Jewish history, Judaism and Zionism.

EDWARD HULTON. Thirty-eight-year-old publisher and editor of *World Review*. Son of Sir Edward Hulton, and grandson of Edward Hulton, founder of *Sunday Chronicle*. He himself founded *Picture Post* which revolutionised British illustrated newspaper standards. Belongs to no political party but has strong political views of his own. These have been collected in a book, *The New Age*, which was published recently, and which sets forth his faith in Beveridge and in a new era.

CAMILLE HUYSMANS, PH.D. Is one of most distinguished political personalities of Belgium. Born 1871, joined the Labour movement early in his youth, and soon rose to become leading international figure in trade union affairs. Was professor at Brussels University, and town councillor of Belgian capital 1905-21. Later became Secretary of second Labour and Socialist Internationale. From 1925 to 1927 Belgian Minister of Science and Art; in 1933 appointed Mayor of Antwerp. Formerly editor of *Flemish Daily*. Has published many books on political and sociological questions. In 1936 became President of Belgian Chamber of Deputies and in 1940 President of Labour and Socialist Internationale. Was in England during occupation of Belgium.

OTTO LEHMANN-RUSSBUELDT. For a number of years was Secretary of German League for Civil Liberties, in which capacity he actively participated in struggle against various nationalistic and reactionary movements in post-war Germany. Forced to leave Germany on account of these activities early in 1933, escaping to Holland first, and later coming to London. Here he published a book on secret re-armament of German Air Force, to which Wickham Steed contributed an introduction.

Biographical Notes

PROF. HYMAN LEVY, M.A., D.S.C., F.R.S.E. Has been Professor of Mathematics at Imperial College of Science and Technology in London since 1923. Born in 1889. Educated at Edinburgh, Goettingen and Oxford. Has been member of Aerodynamics Research Staff of National Physical Laboratory, and Assistant Professor at Royal College of Science. His published books include a study on Aeronautics in Theory and Experiment.

REGINALD SORENSEN. Is Member of Parliament for Leyton West, and has been active as speaker and worker in Labour Movement for over thirty years. Twenty-five years minister of Free Christian Church in Walthamstow and member of Essex County Council. Is known in Parliament for special interest in all humanitarian questions and is Parliamentary Secretary of India League, Chairman of Committee for West African Affairs, and member of Colonial Office Committee for Welfare of Colonial People. Has recently collected various essays which reflect his views on religion, politics and other matters that deeply concern him, and which are shortly to be published in book form.

DR. A. STEINBERG. Educated in Moscow and Heidelberg. Author of many books and essays on Philosophy, Constitutional Law and Jewish History, which have appeared in Russian, German, English, Yiddish and Hebrew. Was at one time Professor of Philosophy in Leningrad. Since 1937 has been co-editor of general Jewish Encyclopaedia in Paris and since 1940 co-director of the Institute of Jewish Learning in London and Honorary Secretary of Research Committee of British Section of World Jewish Congress.

DR. LEV ZELMANOVITZ. Barrister in Moravska Ostrava in Czechoslovakia and leading Zionist in his country. Since 1939 has been Honorary Secretary of "Jewish Party in Czechoslovakia", spokesman of Jewish minority in Czech Government. Came to England in 1939 and has since been Chairman of National Council of Jews from Czechoslovakia and Joint Honorary Secretary of Research Committee of World Jewish Congress in London. Is to-day an acknowledged authority on minority questions.